DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 028 CE 060 777

TITLE	Health Care and ADA Language Education Programs. Cooperative Demonstration Program: High Technology. Final Performance Report.
INSTITUTION	Kanawha County Schools, Charleston, W. Va.; Marion County Schools, Fairmont, W. Va.; West Virginia Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Huntington.; West Virginia State Dept. of Education, Charleston.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Sep 91
CONTRACT	V199A00056
NOTE	165p.; For related documents, see CE 060 778-779.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Vocational Education; Allied Health Occupations Education; Computer Science Education; *Cooperative Programs; Curriculum Development; Demonstration Programs; Educational Cooperation; Institutional Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Programers; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Programing Languages; *Respiratory Therapy; School Business Relationship; Technical Education; Technological Advancement; *Therapists
IDENTIFIERS	*Ada (Programing Language); *Pharmacy Technicians; West Virginia

ABSTRACT

A project implemented cooperative training programs in the three occupational areas: ADA computer language use; respiratory therapy technician; and hospital pharmacy technician. The project's purpose was to demonstrate high technology training programs for adults as a cooperative effort among the West Virginia Department of Education, local schools, business and industry, higher education institutions, and other private and governmental agencies. An advisory committee and consultants assisted project staff in identifying materials and equipment needs, reviewing existing curriculum, adapting or developing curriculum, designing instructional processes, and securing materials and equipment. Although existing curricula with minor modifications were used for the health occupations programs, a new curriculum was developed for the computer language program. Two instructors were used for the respiratory therapy and ADA language programs; one was used for the pharmacy technician program. A third-party evaluation verified that all three instructional programs and the overall project met objectives and carried out planned activities. (Appendixes, amounting to over four-fifths of the report, include the following: final financial report, final site report from the Carver Career and Technical Center regarding respiratory therapy technician and pharmacy technician programs, final site report from Marion County Technical Center regarding computer language program, third-party evaluation report with instruments, and survey information report.) (YLB)

ED344028

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM: HIGH TECHNOLOGY

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Health Care and ADA Language Education Programs

Conducted by

The West Virginia Department of Education

With subcontracts to
Marion County Schools
and
Kanawha County Schools
under a grant from the
United States
Department of Education

Grant #V199A00056

September 30, 1991

CE060777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM:
HIGH TECHNOLOGY

HEALTH OCCUPATION AND ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

CONDUCTED BY
RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
(MARSHALL UNIVERSITY)
BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL,
AND ADULT EDUCATION
WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

With Subcontracts By

Kanawha County Schools
(Carver Career and Technical Education Center)

Marion County Schools
(Marion County Technical Center)

Funded By

Office of Vocational And Adult Education
United States Department of Education
Project Number: V199A00056

SEPTEMBER 30, 1991

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

1990-91

Dr. Charles H. Wagoner, President
Weston, West Virginia

Dr. N. Blaine Groves, Vice-President
Martinsburg, West Virginia

Mr. Virgil C. Cook, Secretary
Daniels, West Virginia

Mr. Michael D. Greer, Member
Clarksburg, West Virginia

Mrs. Audrey Horne, Member
Wheeling West Virginia

Mr. Paul J. Morris, Member
Dunbar, West Virginia

Mrs. Patricia Full Hamner, Member
Buckhannon, West Virginia

Mr. James J. MacCalhum, Member
Madison, West Virginia

Mrs. Frances "Boots" Seago, Member
Athens, West Virginia

Dr. Henry Marockie
State Superintendent of Schools
Charleston, West Virginia

Dr. Adam Sponaugle
Assistant State Superintendent of Schools
Bureau of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education
Charleston, West Virginia

Acknowledgement of Key Personnel

W. Roy Thomas, PhD, Director
Research Coordinating Unit
Marshall University
Project Director

Jan Weece
Project Secretary

-Kanawha County-
Carver Career and Technical Center

Norma Miller, Principal
Project Site Director

Kim Chaffin, Instructor
Respiratory Therapy Technician

Mark James, Instructor
Respiratory Therapy Technician

Miles Crowder, Instructor
Hospital Pharmacy Technician

-Marion County Technical Center-

Roman Prezioso, Administrator
Adult and Community Education
Project Site Director

Murvyn McDowell, Instructor
ADA Language Project Coordinator

Guy Baroni, Instructor
ADA Language Technical Coordinator

(See Staff and Partnership Charts for
additional consultants and business/industry partners)

-Clarence E. Burdette, President
Human Resources Development and Training
Third Party Evaluator

-U. S. Department of Education

Linda Kinney, Grants Specialist
Robert Miller, Project Officer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Final Performance Report..... 1
General..... 1
Objectives..... 1
Management..... 2
Processes..... 3
Table 1..... 4
Table 1A..... 6
Table 1B..... 8
Table 1C..... 10
Table 2..... 12
Table 2A..... 13
Table 2B..... 14
Table 3..... 16
Table 3A..... 17
Table 3B..... 18
Table 3B..... 19
Table 4..... 21
Table 5A..... 22
Table 5B..... 24
Results and Evaluations..... 29
Dissemination..... 32

Appendice A..... 34
Final Financial Report..... 35

Appendice B..... 37
Final Site Report from Carver Career and Technical Center..... 38

Appendice C..... 41
Final Site Report from Marion County Technical Center.....42

Appendice D.....55
Third-Party Evaluation Report.....56

Appendice E.....112
Survey Information Report To Westat Corp.....113

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

General

This Cooperative Demonstration Program (High Technology) entitled, "Cooperative Demonstration of High Technology Programs in Computer Language and Health Occupations" was funded by the U. S. Department of Education. The funding period and time frame of the project was January 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991. The award of funds was $383,704.00 of which $377,086.20.00 was spent. This represents 57 percent of total project expenditures. Total project expenditures were $661,081.12.* The overall project cost per student completing training was $12,019.66 and the federal share cost per completing student was $6,856.11. The financial report is included as Appendice A.

This report is a brief summary of the project objectives, management, processes, results and evaluations, and dissemination. Appendices include a financial report, site summaries, and evaluation summaries. Curriculum materials are being sent as separate documents.

Objectives (initial)

The overall purpose of the project was to demonstrate high technology training programs for adults as a cooperative effort among the State Department of Education, local schools, business and industry, higher education institutions and other

* $150,000 industry donated equipment was not included in financial report.

private and governmental agencies. The specific objectives of the project were:

(a) Implement cooperative training programs in the occupational areas of ADA computer language use, respiratory therapy technician, and hospital pharmacy technician.

(b) Train or retrain unemployed, underemployed or other adults who need upgraded skills in these technical programs.

(c) Place 80% of the trainees in jobs for which trained at the end of the project.

(d) Identify, develop, or adapt instructional materials for program use.

(e) Produce process and evaluative reports at the end of the project.

(f) Disseminate project activities and results on a state and national level.

Management

The project was conducted by the West Virginia Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. This Bureau managed the finances. Operations were managed by the Research Coordinating Unit at Marshall University. Roy Thomas, RCU Director, was the project director (50% time). The RCU Secretary, Jan Weece, was the project secretary (50% time).

The development and conduct of demonstration training programs were performed with subcontractors at two public school districts. Kanawha County Schools (Carver Career and Technical Center) conducted the Respiratory Therapy Technician and Hospital Pharmacy Technician Programs. Marion County Schools (Technical Center) conducted the ADA Computer Language program.

A third party evaluator was contracted to do a summative evaluation.

Processes (objectives a, b, and d)

Preliminary planning and some data collection was done at both sites prior to January 1, 1990. However, this was the official beginning date of the project. The first 7-10 months were spent in developing or adopting curriculum, identifying and securing library and instructional materials, securing instructional staff, securing equipment, organizing clinical sites, and recruiting students.

A very active advisory committee was used on a regular meeting basis for each of the programs. As shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4, these committees included project staff and representatives of related business and industry, higher education, and State Department of Education.

Consultants were contracted for each program who assisted the project staff and advisory committee in identifying materials and equipment needs, reviewing existing curriculum,

Table 1. Student characteristics

TOTAL

Please provide the following information for students in the Cooperative Demonstration project.

		Number of students served by the project
Total number of students served by the project		72
Sex:	Male	22
	Female	50
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Age:	< 18	0
	18-22	14
	23-29	23
	30-39	25
	40+	10
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Race:	White, not of Hispanic origin	66
	Black, not of Hispanic origin	6
	Hispanic	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
English proficiency:		
	English proficient	72
	Limited English proficient	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Special populations:		
	Students with disabilities	0
	Immigrant (non-U.S. citizen born outside the U.S.)	0
	Low-income (annual family income below $13,400)	
	Academically disadvantaged students (reading below 8th grade level)	0
	Unemployed	
	No special circumstances	
	Unknown	72
	Total*	72
Educational attainment:		
	Some high school	0
	High school graduate or GED	52
	Some college	18
	College graduate	2
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Primary educational or vocational goal:		
	Job placement	2
	Job promotion	5
	Vocational certification	65
	High school diploma or GED	
	College credit or CEU's	
	Associate's degree	
	Other (SPECIFY)_____	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72

*Total should equal the total number of students served by the project.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1. Student characteristics (continued)

	Number of students served by the project
Number of hours of instruction received by students from the project during the grant period:	
1-100 hours	10
101-250 hours	10
251-500 hours	3
501-750 hours	25
751-1000 hours	
1000 or more hours	24
Unknown	
Total	72
Type of instruction received (describe):	
Classroom - Laboratory	72
Clinical	59
Total	72
Other services (describe):	
Counselling, Testing, Placement	72
Total	72
Number for whom training continued after the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant ended	1
Employment status at the time of training:	
Full-time	24
Part-time	9
Unemployed	39
Unknown	
Total*	72
For those employed, the number who are employed by:	
Partner organization	13
Non-partner	9
Grantee institution	1
Unknown other	10
Total	33
Training status at end of grant period:	
Currently enrolled	1
Successfully completed	55
Failed	1
Dropped out	15
Unknown	
Total	72
For those who were trained, the number who were:	
Referred to employers	7
Hired	35
Promoted	1
Continued with education	7
Other (SPECIFY) Dropped Out	16
Unknown	6
Total	72

*Total should equal the total number of students served by the project.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	9
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	
Sex:	
Male	7
Female	2
Total	9
Age:	
<18	0
18–22	4
23–29	4
30–39	1
40+	0
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	9
Race:	
White	9
Black	0
Hispanic	0
Asian	0
Other	0
Total	9
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	9
Limited English Proficient	0
Total	9
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	
	0
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	0
12 years	2
13–15 years	5
16 years or more	2
Total	9
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	2
Job Promotion	5
Vocational Certification	2
High School Diploma or GED	0
College Credit or CEU's	0
Associate's Degree	0
Total	9

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1A , (Continued)

	Students Participating in Conservation Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1-100	6
101-250	3
251-500	0
501-750	0
751-1000	0
1000 or more	0
Total	9
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Introductory Hands-on Programming in the ADA Programming Language	9
Total	9
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling	
Job Placement	9
	4
Total	
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	9
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	1
Full Time	7
Part Time	1
Unemployed	1
Total	9
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	3
Non-Partner	4
Grantee Institution	0
Other	1
Total	8
Training Status:	
Enrolled	9
Successfully Completed	8
Unsuccessfully Completed	-
Did Not Complete	1
Total	9
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	3
Hired	3
Promoted	1
Other	5
Total	9

Respiratory

TABLE 1B

Kanawha County

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	34
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	778
Sex:	
Male	10
Female	24
Total	34
Age:	
<18	
18–22	3
23–29	13
30–39	13
40+	5
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	34
Race:	
White	31
Black	3
Hispanic	
Asian	
Other	
Total	34
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	34
Limited English Proficient	
Total	34
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	0
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	~~27~~
12 years	27 7
13–15 years	7
16 years or more	
Total	34
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	
Job Promotion	
Vocational Certification	34
High School Diploma or GED	
College Credit or CEU's	
Associate's Degree	
Total	34

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1B, (Continued)

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1–100	2
101–250	5
251–500	1
501–750	2
751–1000	
1000 or more	24
Total	34
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Classroom Laboratory	34
Clinical	34
Total	34
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling, testing, placement	34
Total	34
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	0
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	
Full Time	16
Part Time	4
Unemployed	14
Total	34
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	10
Non-Partner	
Grantee Institution	1
Other	9
Total	20
Training Status:	
Enrolled	34
Successfully Completed	24
Unsuccessfully Completed	
Did Not Complete	10
Total	34
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	
Hired	21
Promoted	
Other	13
Total	34

Pharmacy Tech.

TABLE 1C Kanawha County

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	29
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	778
Sex:	
Male	5
Female	24
Total	29
Age:	
<18	0
18–22	7
23–29	6
30–39	11
40+	5
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	29
Race:	
White	26
Black	3
Hispanic	0
Asian	0
Other	0
Total	29
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	29
Limited English Proficient	
Total	29
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	
12 years	23
13–15 years	6
16 years or more	
Total	29
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	
Job Promotion	
Vocational Certification	29
High School Diploma or GED	
College Credit or CEU's	
Associate's Degree	
Total	29

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1C, (Continued)

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1-100	2
101-250	2
251-500	2
501-750	654 23
751-1000	
1000 or more	
Total	654 29
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Classroom (Didactic)	414 29
Clinical Rotation	240 25
Total	654 29
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling, testing, placement	29
Total	29
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	0
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	
Full Time	1
Part Time	4
Unemployed	24
Total	29
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	
Non-Partner	5
Grantee Institution	
Other	
Total	5
Training Status:	
Enrolled	29
Successfully Completed	23
Unsuccessfully Completed	1
Did Not Complete	5
Total	29
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	4
Hired	11
Promoted	
Other	13
Total	29

Table 2. Staff Characteristics

Please complete the following information for each project staff member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Member name (including instructors)	Roy Thomas	Loretta Cole	Brenda Williams	Ralph Green	
Position/title	Project Director	State Health Education Coordinator	Data Systems Coordinator	State T & I Edu Coordinator	
Project responsibilities	Managing Reporting Dissem-ination	Advisory & Dissem-ination	Advisory	Advisory & Dissem-ination	
Wage rate (hourly)	39,267.00 annual	42,000 annual	44,000 annual	41,000 annual	
Date started on project	1/1/90	1/1/90	1/1/90	1/1/90	
Date ended work on project	9/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	
% Full-time equivalent on project	50	5	3	5	
Source of funding (if not grant)	Grant & State	State	State	State	

Total number of hours worked on:

Student assessment					
Training students					
Staff development	25				
Curriculum development	75	10			
Skills identification	25	5		1	
Dissemination/diffusion	100	50	25	60	
Partnerships/networking	25	6	17	10	
Project administration/ planning	1075				
Other (SPECIFY) Preparing Reports	100				
Total hours worked on project	1425	71	42	71	

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Guy Baroni	Murv McDowell	Roman Prezioso	E. R. Smith	
Position/Title	Technical Coordinator	Project Coordinator	Local Site Coordinator	Industrial Liasion	
Project Responsibilities	Technical Coordinator	Overall Project Coordination	Individual/ Project Administration	Industrial Liasion	
Wage Rate	$15/hr	$21.32/hr	$45,320/yr	$40/hr	
Date Started on Project	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	
Date Ended Work on Project	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	
% FTE on Project	100%	100%	10%	10%	
Source of Funding (if not grant)			In-kind	In-kind	

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment	35				
Training Students	550	100			
Staff Development	50	220			
Curriculum Development	1428	422			
Skills Identification	45				
Dissemination/ Diffusion	620	560			
Partnerships/ Networking	45	520		22	
Project Administration/ Planning	100	1100	361	340	
Other	25				
Total Hours Worked on Project	2898	2922	361	362	

TABLE 2B Kanawha County

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Norma Miller	Kim Chaffin	Mark James	Roy Kemp	Miles Crowder
Position/Title	Principal	Instructor	Instructor	Instructor	Instructor
Project Responsibilities	Adm./Planning Staff Dev. Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking
Wage Rate	$44,090.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual
Date Started on Project	1/1/90	7/19/90	7/19/90	10/22/90	7/19/90
Date Ended Work on Project	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	10/19/90
% FTE on Project	10	100	100	100	100
Source of Funding (if not grant)	State	Grant State	Grant State	Grant State	Grant State
Total Number of Hours Worked on:					
Student Assessment	20	50	50	35	15
Training Students	0	1320	1320	840	360
Staff Development	32	14	14	10	4
Curriculum Development	18	30	30	21	9
Skills Identification	30	20	20	14	6
Dissemination/ Diffusion	12	6	6	4	2
Partnerships/ Networking	44	100	100	70	30
Project Administration/ Planning	196	140	140	98	42
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours Worked on Project	252	1680	1680	1190	490

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Karen Cavender	Jean Fisher	Sharon Landsdale		
Position/Title	Consultant	Consultant	Consultant		
Project Responsibilities	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking		
Wage Rate	$100/day	$100/day	$100/day		
Date Started on Project	11/20/90	3/3/90	3/3/90		
Date Ended Work on Project	6/12/91	5/8/91	11/8/90		
% FTE on Project	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed		
Source of Funding (if not grant)	Grant	Grant	Grant		

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development		10	10		
Curriculum Development	30	50	20		
Skills Identification	20	50	10		
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking	10	30			
Project Administration/ Planning	20	20			
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	80	160	40		

Table 3. First partner organization data

Please complete the following information for each staff member from the first partner organization. If there is not enough space on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

	(Marion)	(Kanawha)			
Partner staff member name (including instructors)	Theodore K. LaRue	14 Staff	See Table 3B		
Position at partner organization	Assistant Prof. Comp. Sci.	Director & Supervision			
Project responsibilities	Consultant In-Service Provider	Advisory & Provide Clinical			
Date started on project	1/1/90	7/18/90			
Date stopped on project	6/28/91	6/30/91			
% FTE on project	3	120			

Total number of hours worked on:					
Student assessment		430			
Training students		1690			
Staff development	50	34			
Curriculum development	10	50			
Skills identification	20	46			
Dissemination/diffusion	10	10			
Partnerships/networking	10	22			
Project administration/ planning		45			
Other (SPECIFY) _____		16			
Total hours worked on project	100	2343			

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	E R Smith J & S Machine	Hawken Associates	W V University	Fairmont State College	Darby
Position at Partner Organization	President		Professor	Professor	Teacher Preston Co School
Project Responsibilities	Liaison	Advisory	Consultant	Consultant	Consultant
Date Started on Project	1-1-90	1-1-90	1-1-90	1-1-90	3-1-90
Date Stopped on Project	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91
% FTE on Project	10	5	3	5	7
Total Number of Hours Worked on:					
Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development			40	70	
Curriculum Development			20	20	120
Skills Identification		25	25	20	45
Dissemination/ Diffusion				20	30
Partnerships/ Networking	22	25	15	20	20
Project Administration/ Planning	340	100			
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	362	150	100	150	215

TABLE 3B

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Bryon Young	Bill Pennybacker	Cheryl Snodgrass	Anna Parkman	Karen Zabawezuk
Position at Partner Organization	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept. St. Francis	Dir of Resp. Care Dept. Thomas Mem. Hosp.	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept. Putnam Gen. Hosp.	Dir. of Resp. Therapist Program Univ. of Chas	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept. CAMC
Project Responsibilities	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Chairperson
Date Started on Project					
Date Stopped on Project	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
% FTE on Project	1.7	.5	.5	1.5	1.8
Total Number of Hours Worked on:					
Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development	8				8
Curriculum Development	10			6	10
Skills Identification	2			1	2
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking	1			20	10
Project Administration/ Planning		10	10		
Other	12				4
Total Hours Worked on Project	33	10	10	27	34

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3B, Continued

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Ike Fauber	Liz Davis	Tim Bess	JoBeth Nicols	Jay Wildt
Position at Partner Organization	Educational Coordinator	Educational Coordinator	Supervisor	Supervisor	Dir. of Respir Care Dept. at Montgomery Gen.
Project Responsibilities	Works with Students Oversees clinical instructor at General and W&C Div. of CAMC	Works with students Oversees clinical instructors at Memorial Div. of CAMC	Trains students. Oversees clinical instructors at Thomas Memorial Hospital	Trains students Oversees clinical instructors at St. Francis Hospital	Serves on Advisory Committee. Works with students. Oversees clinical instructors
Date Started on Project	7/18/90	7/18/90	7/18/90	7/18/90	3/90
Date Stopped on Project	6/14/91	6/14/91	6/14/91	6/14/91	Continuing
% FTE on Project	13	13	30	30	17

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment	85	85	85	85	50
Training Students	170	170	500	500	250
Staff Development					8
Curriculum Development					10
Skills Identification					2
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking					1
Project Administration/ Planning					
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	255	255	585	585	321

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Barbara Gastinean	Tom Robinette	Jeff Hess	Heidi Braun	Mike Danner
Position at Partner Organization	Dir. Of Out-Patient Pharmacy	Dir. Of Pharmacy Thomas Mem. Hosp.	Dir. Of In-Patient CAMC General	Dir. Of Pharmacy Women's & Childrens Hos	Dir. Of Pharmacy Montgomery Gen. Hosp.
Project Responsibilities	Advisory Committee Member Supv. Students while at this site.Help with Program Dev.	Advisory Committee Member Supv.Students while at this site.Help with Program Dev.	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site
Date Started on Project	7/18	7/18	7/18	7/18	7/18
Date Stopped on Project	6/30	6/30	6/30	6/30	6/30
% FTE on Project	3	3	2	2	2
Total Number of Hours Worked on:					
Student Assessment	8	8	8	8	8
Training Students	20	20	20	20	20
Staff Development	5	5			
Curriculum Development	10	10			
Skills Identification	8	8	8	8	8
Dissemination/ Diffusion	2	2	2	2	2
Partnerships/ Networking	2	2	2	2	2
Project Administration/ Planning	5	5	5	5	5
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	60	60	45	45	45

Table 4. Second partner organization data

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the second partner organization. If there is not enough space on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

	(Marion)	(Kanawha)			
Project staff name (including instructors)	E. R. Smith	Anna Parkman			
Position at partner organization	President J & S Machine	Director of Resp. Ther. U of Charleston			
Project responsibilities	Liaison	Advisory			
Date started on project	1/1/90	1/1/90			
Date stopped on project	6/28/91	6/30/91			
% FTE on project	10	1.5			

Total number of hours worked on:

Student assessment					
Training students					
Staff development					
Curriculum development		6			
Skills identification		1			
Dissemination/diffusion					
Partnerships/networking	22	20			
Project administration/ planning	340				
Other (SPECIFY) _____					
Total hours worked on project	362	27			

TABLE 5A, Project Outcome Data

Marion County

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	ADA Course				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	9				
Participating	9				
Completing	8				
Not completing	1				
# of hours training or service	108				
# of service sessions	18				
# placed in jobs	4				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

TABLE 5A, Continued

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Introductory DOS	ADA Teacher Workshop	Introductory DOS	CMU - FMI State Col Manager Workshop	CAD - Intro FMI State Col Manager Workshop
Number of grantee students					
Registering	11		4		
Participating	11		4		
Completing	11		3		
Not completing	0		1		
# of hours training or service	24		24		
# of service sessions	12		12		
# placed in jobs	11		3		
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering		30		4	3
Participating		30		4	3
Completing		30			
Not completing		0			
# of hours training or service		18		4	4
# of service sessions		2.5		1	1
# placed in jobs		N/A		N/A	N/A
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering			3	22	12
Participating			3	20	11
Completing			3	-	11
Not completing					
# of hours training or service			12	4	4
# of service sessions			3	1	1
# placed in jobs			N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE 5B

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Respiratory Technician				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	34				
Participating	34				
Completing	24				
Not completing	10				
# of hours training or service	1418				
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs	21				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

TABLE 5B, Continued

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Pharmacy Technician				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	29				
Participating					
Completing	23				
Not completing	6				
# of hours training or service	654				
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs	12				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

adapting or developing curriculum, designing instructional processes and securing materials and equipment.

The Respiratory Therapy Technician programs at Carver decided that the "Entry-Level Respiratory Therapy Program, Volumes I and II" from the California College for Health Sciences - San Diego, 222 West 24th Street, National City, California 92050 was an appropriate curriculum with minor adaptations. This curriculum already meets national certification requirements. Carver has an application pending for national certification which will likely be approved in December 1991. Along with this curriculum, as a separate document, is a list of reference material for the library (78 titles), a list of instructional aids (51) including videos, charts and models, computer software programs (8), and a list of 30 pieces of equipment donated by health care providers to set up the laboratory at Carver. This equipment is valued at $150,000.

The Hospital Pharmacy Technician Program at Carver reviewed existing curriculum and materials and decided that one was appropriate with minor modifications. The "Pharmacy Certified Technician - Training Manual" from Michigan Pharmacists Association, 1990, 815 N. Washington, Lansing, Michigan 48906, was chosen and adapted. Needed supplies and instructional materials were identified and secured. The program has been submitted to the State Board of Pharmacy to provide certification for graduates.

The ADA Computer Language Program at Marion County Technical Center was conducted as part of the Robotics/Automated Technology Program. A search for curriculum and materials identified some individual segments which could be used. However, a curriculum had to be developed. The curriculum, "A Secondary/Post-Secondary Curriculum For The ADA Programming Language" was developed, field tested, and revised using some existing materials. The curriculum is designed to use the "ADA Training Environment" and "IntegrAda" compiler with optional "On-line Training and Reference Manual". These Computer Aided Instruction programs are available from the AETECH Corporation for IBM PC compatible computers. The proposed curriculum was to serve adult technical students and business and industry personnel. After some deliberation it was developed as a comprehensive series of instructional modules which could be used at the secondary or post-secondary level and students could start at a point which met their needs and stop when feasible. It serves the up-grading function very well.

Another plus from the ADA program was the development and use of a workshop document for business/industry and other agency personnel entitled, "Management Training Series - DOS For Managers".

The major emphasis for all three programs was training persons for the occupational area using the processes and materials which were approved. For the Respiratory Therapy

program, two teachers were employed and students were recruited. An eleven month instructional program was conducted between August 1, 1990 and June 30, 1991. Students were screened with appropriate tests and interviews and were evaluated for progress at intervals and at the end of the program. Sixty percent of the student's time was spent in classroom/laboratory activities and forty percent was spent in clinical activities provided by health care providers in their facilities.

In the Pharmacy Technician program, one teacher was employed. He was unable to perform his duties after some period of time and was replaced by another instructor during the third week of October, 1990 without any delay in instruction. Students were recruited and screened and two 5-1/2 month training programs were conducted beginning in August, 1990 and January, 1991. Sixty percent of the student's time was spent in the classroom and forty percent in clinical activities provided by health care providers and Rite Aid Pharmacy in their facilities. Students were evaluated for progress at intervals and at the end of their program.

Although considerable time was required for development in the ADA Language program, the instructional part of the program was very important. Two instructors were used and they were also the primary staff involved in curriculum development and program management. Selected adult students in the Robotics/Automated Technology program participated in

the ADA language instruction. They were involved in 18 sessions of 6 hours each during the six month period from January 1, 1991 to June 30, 1991. Their progress was evaluated continually and their input into curriculum revision was invaluable.

During this same six-month period, the program staff conducted two "Introductory DOS" workshops for business and industry and other agency personnel; three ADA workshops at two locations for programming and other interested teachers from across the state; and two "Management Workshops" which were short sessions to familiarize business and industry personnel with ADA and its availability.

As shown by this section, objectives a, b, and d were met. The program was implemented as planned, students were trained and excellent curriculum and materials were adapted or developed. The objectives were exceeded in that the ADA curriculum meets the needs of all levels of students; a "DOS For Managers" curriculum was developed; and certification for pharmacy technicians seems to be forthcoming.

Results and Evaluations (objectives b, c, and e)

The "Third-Party Evaluation" by Clarence E. Burdette is attached as appendice D. This report verifies that all three of the instructional programs and the overall project met the planned objectives and carried out the planned activities. The curriculum, materials, and instructional procedures are outstanding. The facilities and equipment,

except hospital pharmacy, are excellent. A hospital pharmacy laboratory is being set up for the next round of classes. A survey of students, employers and advisory committee members and teachers, clinical supervisors and administrators was conducted.

The results of the surveys for the ADA Language program were consistently above 4.0 on a 5 point scale with regard to the appropriateness and usefulness of the curriculum, instructional processes, and facilities. Feed-back on in-service workshops for teachers and business and industry personnel was excellent.

The respiratory therapy survey results showed a difference in ratings between students and non-students (staff, etc.). The respondents, other than students, consistently rated the curriculum, materials, instructional process and facilities and equipment above 4.0 on a 5 point scale as to their appropriateness and usefulness. One exception was that student admission criteria needs to be revised to select most appropriate students. The students rated the appropriateness of the subject matter, materials and references, and clinical activities above 4.0 on a 5 point scale. All other questions were rated between 3.0 and 4.0 except student evaluations which was rated 2.86.

The pharmacy technician survey results showed consistent ratings above 4.0 for the appropriateness and usefulness of the curriculum, materials, and instructional processes.

However, students and teachers, clinical supervisors and administrators rated admission criteria, clinical coordination and facilities, and equipment and supplies between 3.0 and 4.0.

A copy of the survey done for the national third-party evaluator, Westat, Corp., is attached as appendice E. Tables 1-6 in this report are from that document. Tables 1 and 5 show that for the overall project in all three programs 72 students enrolled and 55 completed. They were all adults, six of them were black, and all had a high school equivalent education or more. Thirty-nine of them were unemployed when training began. Of the 55 who completed, seven were already employed, one was promoted, seven continued their education for further upgrading, five were seeking employment, and thirty-five were placed in jobs. Forty completers were available for job placement and thirty-five were placed for a placement rate of 87.5 percent. This exceeds the goal set at 80 percent in objective (c).

The ADA program had a goal of 10 students at the Technical Center and 10 from business and industry. These goals were essentially met. Table 5A shows that 9 automated manufacturing students participated in the ADA language program at the Technical Center and 8 completed. Fifteen business/industry and other agency personnel participated and 14 completed the "Introductory DOS" workshop. Twenty-four managers and staff participated in the manager's workshop on computer technologies and 14 managers and staff participated

in a managers workshop on computer assisted drafting and manufacturing. Thirty teachers of programming from around the state completed 18 hours of in-service at one of three workshops to familiarize them with ADA and the program.

The goal for the Respiratory Therapy Technician Program was 30 students. Table 5B shows 34 were enrolled and 24 completed the program. The admission criteria allowed some students in who could not successfully do the work.

The goal for the Pharmacy Technician program was 30 students. Table 5B shows that 29 were enrolled and 23 completed the program.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 shows excellent and direct involvement of business and industry and higher education personnel.

Dissemination (objective f)

Much dissemination has already been done but it is continuing at the time of this report. One television report and five newspaper articles helped announce and promote the project. Project staff made presentations about each program regarding status, availability, and content at the West Virginia Conference for Vocational Education and at a statewide vocational directors conference.

The workshops by ADA program staff, outlined in the previous section were also part of the dissemination effort.

The Carver Career and Technical Center staff have developed and distributed excellent recruitment and promotion brochures for the health care programs.

The project director made announcements or presentations at conferences of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education in Seattle, Washington and Annapolis, Maryland; at the American Vocational Association Conference in Cincinnati, Ohio; at the annual conference of the National Association for Program Improvement in Vocational Education in St. Louis; and at the project director's conference in Washington, D. C. in March 1990.

Copies of the final report and all curriculum materials have or are being sent to the U. S. Department of Education, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the ERIC system, the East Central Curriculum Center, and the West Virginia Curriculum Center.

Copies of the final report and the ADA curriculum are being presented to all vocational directors in West Virginia.

Copies of the final report only are being distributed to all State Directors of Vocational Education.

This project has been very beneficial and has accomplished what was planned. West Virginia is very grateful to the U. S. Department of Education for allowing us this privilege.

APPENDICE A

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

(Short Form)

(Follow instructions on the back)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned By Federal Agency	OMB Approval No.	Page	of
U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	GRANT V199A0056 CAN OE002715	0348-0039	1	1 pages

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address, including ZIP code)
W V DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL AND ADULT
1900 Kanawha Blvd., E Rm B-221
Charleston WV 25305

4. Employer Identification Number	5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number	6. Final Report	7. Basis
1 556000768-A1	7794-24 CAN 253	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Cash ☐ Accrual

8. Funding/Grant Period (See instructions) From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)	9. Period Covered by this Report From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)
January 1, 1990	June 30, 1991	January 1, 1990	June 30, 1991

10 Transactions:	I Previously Reported	II This Period	III Cumulative
a. Total outlays			511,082.12
b. Recipient share of outlays			133,995.92
c. Federal share of outlays			377,086.20
d. Total unliquidated obligations			0
e. Recipient share of unliquidated obligations			0
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations			0
g. Total Federal share (*Sum of lines c and f*)			377,086.20
h. Total Federal funds authorized for this funding period			383,704.00
i. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (*Line h minus line g*)			6,617.80

11 Indirect Expense	a. Type of Rate (*Place "X" in appropriate box*) ☐ Provisional ☐ Predetermined ☐ Final ☐ Fixed			
	b. Rate N/A	c. Base	d. Total Amount	e. Federal Share

12. *Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation.*

13. Certification: **I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unliquidated obligations are for the purposes set forth in the award documents.**

Typed or Printed Name and Title	Telephone (Area code, number and extension)
HENRY MAROCKIE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS	(304) 348-2346 (Sponaugle)
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official	**Date Report Submitted**
H Marock	September 30, 1991

Previous Editions not Usable

Standard Form 269A (REV 4-88)
Prescribed by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

(Short Form)

Please type or print legibly. The following general instructions explain how to use the form itself. You may need additional information to complete certain items correctly, or to decide whether a specific item is applicable to this award. Usually, such information will be found in the Federal agency's grant regulations or in the terms and conditions of the award. You may also contact the Federal agency directly.

Item	Entry

1, 2 and 3. Self-explanatory.

4. Enter the employer identification number assigned by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.

5. Space reserved for an account number or other identifying number assigned by the recipient.

6. Check *yes* only if this is the last report for the period shown in item 8.

7. Self-explanatory.

8. Unless you have received other instructions from the awarding agency, enter the beginning and ending dates of the current funding period. If this is a multi-year program, the Federal agency might require cumulative reporting through consecutive funding periods. In that case, enter the beginning and ending dates of the grant period, and in the rest of these instructions, substitute the term "grant period" for "funding period."

9. Self-explanatory.

10. The purpose of columns, I, II and III is to show the effect of this reporting period's transactions on cumulative financial status. The amounts entered in column I will normally be the same as those in column III of the previous report in *the same funding period*. If this is the first or only report of the funding period, leave columns I and II blank. If you need to adjust amounts entered on previous reports, footnote the column I entry on this report and attach an explanation.

10a. Enter total program outlays less any rebates, refunds, or other credits. For reports prepared on a cash basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for direct costs for goods and services, the amount of indirect expense charged, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the amount of cash advances and payments made to sub-recipients. For reports prepared on an accrual basis, outlays are the sum of actual cash disbursements for direct charges for goods and services, the amount of indirect expense incurred, the value of in-kind contributions applied, and the net increase or decrease in the amounts owed by the recipient for goods and other property received, for services performed by employees, contractors, subgrantees and other payees, and other amounts becoming owed under programs for which no current services or performances are required, such as annuities, insurance claims, and other benefit payments.

10b. Self-explanatory.

10c. Self-explanatory.

10d. Enter the amount of unliquidated obligations, including unliquidated obligations to subgrantees and contractors.

Unliquidated obligations on a cash basis are obligations incurred, but not yet paid. On an accrual basis, they are obligations incurred, but for which an outlay has not yet been recorded.

Do not include any amounts on line 10d that have been included on lines 10a, b or c.

On the final report, line 10d must be zero.

10e, f, g, h and i. Self-explanatory.

11a. Self-explanatory.

11b. Enter the indirect cost rate in effect during the reporting period.

11c. Enter the amount of the base against which the rate was applied.

11d. Enter the total amount of indirect costs charged during the report period.

11e. Enter the Federal share of the amount in 11d.

Note: If more than one rate was in effect during the period shown in item 8, attach a schedule showing the bases against which the different rates were applied, the respective rates, the calendar periods they were in effect, amounts of indirect expense charged to the project, and the Federal share of indirect expense charged to the project to date.

APPENDICE B

FINAL SITE REPORT

CARVER CAREER AND TECHNICAL CENTER

CARVER CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

GRANT REPORT

RESPIRATORY THERAPY TECHNICIAN
and
PHARMACY TECHNICIAN PROGRAMS

September, 1991

Charleston Area Medical Center (CAMC) is the largest hospital complex in the State of West Viginia. Carver Career Center, in its continuing effort to serve local businesses/industries has maintained a close working relationship with CAMC along with other health care providers and representatives of other types of industries.

As part of this continuing relationship, personnel from CAMC expressed to the administrator of Carver a need for trained applicants to fill openings as Respiratory Therapy Technicians and Pharmacy Technicians. In response to that suggested need, the administrator contacted other health care organizations in the area and invited them to meet as Advisory Committees to explore the possibilities. The first meetings of these committees took place in the spring of 1989.

The members (representing all major local hospitals) confirmed that they were having difficulty within their own organizations and initiated surveys of health care providers throughout the state to determine the extent of the need. The results confirmed that this was a wide spread problem and that there was indeed a shortage of trained personnel in these areas.

A search for other educational institutions offering these programs revealed that there were no Respiratory Therapy Technician or Pharmacy Technician programs in the state.

In July, 1989, Carver submitted a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education for funds for planning and for the first year of operation. The award announcement was received in December of 1989. Shortly thereafter, consultants were hired to develop curricula and plan the programs. Instructors were hired in July, 1990, and the first classes started in August, 1990.

We have completed on full year of operation of these programs. We have experienced a high degree of interest on the part of students, with approximately three applicants for every available opening in the classes. We have also sustained high interest from the local health community. They continue to serve on our Advisory Committees, to donate

supplies and equipment, and, more importantly, to provide clinical training for our students. The hospitals that are participating are Charleston Area Medical Center (General, Memorial and Women & Children's Divisions), St. Francis Hospital, Montgomery General Hospital, and Thomas Memorial Hospital. In addition, Rite Aid Pharmacy, the state's largest chain of retail pharmacies, participates in the Pharmacy Technician program.

One class of twenty-four Respiratory Therapy Technicians has graduated. Of these, twenty-two are working in the field. The other two are not available for employment at this time. The second class started their training in August of this year.

Two classes of Pharmacy Technicians have graduated, with a total of 24 graduates. Of these, 10 are employed in the field, 4 are in related employment, 1 is employed in an unrelated field, 1 is continuing her education, 3 are not available for employment, and 5 are still in the application/interviewing process. Placement of these graduates was initially hampered by pre-existing hospital policies requiring the hiring of current employees from other job classifications (un-trained) before openings could be made available to non-employees. Those policies are now being changed and placements are accelerating. The third class of Pharmacy Technicians started in August of this year.

The Joint Review Committee for Respiratory Therapy Education has granted Carver a Letter of Intent for national accreditation and our June graduates are eligible to take the national Certification examination for Respiratory Therapy Technicians. Full accreditation status is anticipated after the Review Committee makes its on-site evaluation later this fall.

Charleston Area Medical Center has established a scholarship program for Carver students in the Respiratory program. Two students in this year's class were awarded $1,300. each. If these students maintain the defined academic progress, they are guaranteed employment at CAMC after graduation from Carver and are assured of scholarships to the University of Charleston to continue their respiratory training to the Associate Degree (Respiratory Therapist) level at that institution.

The University of Charleston has established a bridge program to take any interested Carver graduates into the Associate program with credit given for their studies at Carver.

The establishment of the Pharmacy Technician program has generated action toward a change in West Virginia law relating to the employment of Technicians. The W. Va.

Chapter of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists has presented a proposal to the State Board of Pharmacy for changes that would specify the duties that can be performed by a Technician and would set forth the requirements for training.

As a direct result of the successes of these two programs, Carver has taken a leadership role in health care training in the Charleston area. The school has started an EKG training program and plans to start an Ophthalmic Assistant program in January. Other health care programs are in the planning stages.

The project has proven that area vocational centers can provide training and job opportunities to un-employed and under-employed residents and can, at the same time, help the local health care community meet its need for trained employees in technical positions.

APPENDICE C

FINAL SITE REPORT

MARION COUNTY TECHNICAL CENTER

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

OF THE

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (HIGH TECH)
DTD 07/20/89
COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION OF HIGH TECH. PROGRAMS
IN COMPUTER LANGUAGE

CONCEPT

This Project, "Industrial Applications of Ada Computer Language", originated from a proposal "To develop a Cooperative Demonstration Project to train workers and to educate prospective employers in High Technology industrial applications involving the Ada computer language."

The perceived need for such a program was stated in the original proposal as follows:

> "It is obvious that trained technicians are essential to support high tech industrial systems. It is less obvious, but equally essential, that potential employers must be literate in the new and evolving technologies, in order to utilize these technicians and their abilities to promote industrial growth. To be most effective, therefore, a training program must reach both technicians and their employers."

To answer the perceived need, a two-pronged plan of operation was followed; the first was directed toward the training of 'technician level' employees, and the second was directed toward educating potential employers.

ORGANIZATION

The team that was organized to accomplish the goals of this project consisted of the following:

Project Director:
Dr. Roy Thomas, Ph.D.
Director
Research Coordinating Unit
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia

Site Director:
Roman W. Prezioso, Jr.
Administrator
Adult and Community Education
Marion County Technical Center
Farmington, West Virginia

Project Coordinator:
Murvyn McDowell
Instructor
Robotics/Automation Technology
Marion County Technical Center
Farmington, West Virginia

Technical Coordinator:
Guy Baroni
Instructor
Robotics/Automation Technology
Marion County Technical Center
Farmington, West Virginia

Industrial Liaison:
E. Robert Smith
President
J & S Machine Company
Fairmont, West Virginia

Technical Consultants:
Randall L. Baker
Instructor
Computer Science
Fairmont State College
Fairmont, West Virginia

Technical Consultants:
(Continued)

Dr. Gerald Bacza
Professor
Division of Technology
Fairmont State College
Fairmont, West Virginia

Dr. William Griscom
Director of Economic Development
Chairman, Division of Technology
Professor of Technology
Fairmont State College
Fairmont, West Virginia

Theodore K. LaRue
Assistant Professor
Computer Science
Fairmont State College
Fairmont, West virginia

Darby Shafer
Instructor
Computer Science
Preston Education Center
Kingwood, West Virginia

Robert Terry
Instructor
Computer Science
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Industrial Consultants:

Alvin D. Allison
President
AMPS Automation, Inc.
Morgantown, West Virginia

Industrial Consultants: (continued)

Ralph Crafts
President
Software Strategies and Tactics
Harpers Ferry, West Virginia

Karen J. Fleming
AdaNET Operations Manager
MountainNet
Dellslow, West Virginia

Alan Hart
Technical Coordinator
Software Valley, Inc.
Morgantown, West Virginia

Peggy Lacy
User Service Coordinator
MountainNet
Dellslow, West Virginia

Fred Noble
President
Marble Computer
Martinsburg, West Virginia

Thomas Pressman
President
Strictly Business
Huntington, West Virginia

James Thomes
President
AEtech Corporation
Solans Beach, California

Barbara Weaver
Federal Contracting Specialist
Small Business Administration
Clarksburg, West Virginia

David G. Weaver
Program Manager
Aerospace Engineering Division
Engineering and Economics Research, Inc.
Martinsburg, West Virginia

Higher Ed. Consultants:

Dr. Donald Butcher
Chairman
Division of Statistics and Computer Science
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Dr. Leonard Collelli
Assistant Chairman, Division of Technology
Associate Professor
Fairmont State College

Winsome Mundy
Instructor
Computer Science
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Dr. Francis VanSkoy
Professor
Computer Science Department
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

It should be noted that the above Industrial and Higher Ed. Consultants all gave freely of their time, knowledge, and advice without renumeration. Their courtesy, encouragement, and direction, were highly instrumental in bringing this project to fruition.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE 'TECHNICIAN LEVEL' CURRICULUM

Immediately after the awarding of the grant, the Project Coordinator and the Technical Coordinator were given leaves of absence from their teaching duties in order to devote full time to this project. It was found, just days after the grant award, that the Computer Science Department of West Virginia University was offering an introductory course in the Ada programming language. This opportunity for both the Project Coordinator and Technical Coordinator to obtain a thorough understanding of the language, at very low cost, and without complete reliance upon technical consultants, was to prove highly beneficial to the success of the project. In addition to completing this introductory course, the Technical Consultant completed a second, more advanced course, in order to be better prepared to assemble the curriculum and to help conduct the workshops which were to be held for teachers from throughout the state of West Virginia.

Since Ada is a compiled language, an important decision which had to be made in the very early phase of this project was the selection of a compiler. An early decision was essential, since neither program development nor testing could be completed without a compiler. One of the considerations involved in selecting a compiler source was the issue of verification. In order to be verified, Ada compilers must undergo rigorous testing by the Department of Defense. After early discussions with industrial consultants, including Mr. Ralph Crafts, President of Software Strategies & Tactics, it was felt that it was important that the chosen compiler be verified, thus assuring that programs, laboratory experiments, and examples, developed as part of the curriculum would be transportable to other hardware systems. Although compilers for PC-type equipment operate at a much slower speed, and may not include all of the sophisticated error checking and similar programming aids that are available in compilers operating on more elaborate computer systems, it is felt that financial constraints dictate that public school systems utilize PC equipment. At the inception of this project, only a very limited number of sources for compilers which would operate on PC systems were available. Of those sources for PC-based compilers, AEtech Corporation, through its President, Mr. James Thomes, was extremely enthusiastic about the possibility of developing a curriculum for Ada training at the Secondary and Post-secondary levels. His prior experience in training military personnel as well as non-traditional students in a civilian setting, made Mr. Thomes feel that this project would prove to be of great value. Because of this, AEtech Corporation offered substantial discounts. These discounts, coupled with the excellent learning environment provided by the AEtech software, led to the choice of that company as the source of the compiler used in this project.

One of the unique issues to be faced in the development of this project is the general preconception among the "Ada community" that it is necessary for students to have a prior knowledge of computers and computer programming in order to begin training in the Ada language. Such a prior knowledge does not exist in the vast majority of students entering Post-secondary vocational programs. During discussions with consultants at West Virginia University, and at AdaNET, it was learned that an instructor at Preston Education Center,

Darby Shafer, was teaching Ada to Secondary students, as part of an independently initiated program. Subsequent discussions with Mrs. Shafer led to the conclusion that a properly developed, modularized, Ada curriculum could fulfill not only the needs of Post-secondary Vocational students, but Secondary students as well. In order to draw upon her experience in teaching Ada to students with little or no previous computer programming training, Mrs. Shafer was employed as a consultant to this project. Her advice and knowledge have been extremely beneficial in making the resulting curriculum applicable to an extended range of potential students.

Because it was possible for the Technical Coordinator, Mr. Guy Baroni, to attend Ada classes at West Virginia University and to gain a thorough knowledge of the language, it was possible for him to write a great deal of the resulting curriculum, and to organize and edit those sections which were being developed by outside consultants. His efforts greatly reduced the dependance upon outside consultants, and permitted the subsequent reallocation of funds, allowing for a higher quality and larger quantity of materials to be made available for the dissemination of the resulting curriculum and associated materials.

The Higher Ed. participants in this phase of the Cooperative Demonstration Project, West Virginia University and Fairmont State College, played major and key roles in the development of the curriculum. Mr. Robert Terry of WVU reviewed and critiqued the curriculum as it was being developed. His thorough knowledge of the Ada language, complemented by his prior experience in teaching students on the Secondary level, proved invaluable in refining the final product. Mr. Randall Baker of FSC reviewed and performed all of the laboratory experiments that are presented, and offered numerous constructive comments which were subsequently utilized.

As the Ada curriculum evolved, it was integrated into the curriculum of the Post-Secondary Robotics/Automation Technologies program at Marion County Technical Center. Evaluating the results derived from those classes, which were conducted by Mr. Baroni, was immediately utilized to improve and/or clarify the instructional material. In addition to the interaction provided by conducting these classes, three separate workshops were held for Vocational and Secondary teachers from throughout the state of West Virginia. These two-day workshops were designed to provide a cross-section of teachers with a basic understanding of the Ada language. An additional benefit was derived from the positive feedback from the participating teachers, many of whom were teaching various levels of computer programming, or computer related classes. It was possible to take advantage of their teaching experience by incorporating any appropriate suggestions into the curriculum as it developed into its final form.

Mr. Ted LaRue, of Fairmont State College, was the principal instructor at the teacher workshops, and was responsible for originating much of the materials which were utilized. His wide range of knowledge of computer programming languages permitted Mr. LaRue to help participating teachers to relate Ada to their own areas of expertise. As a result, it is anticipated that incorporating Ada programming as part of a state-wide curriculum will be

much more readily and enthusiastically accepted. In addition, Mr. LaRue was an invaluable, readily available, and precisely accurate, source of facts regarding Ada, computer systems, and programming in general. His close cooperation and advice have been invaluable to this project from its inception. From explanations of elementary Ada techniques, through the selection of various software systems, to the "proofing" of the final products, Mr. LaRue has played an irreplaceable role.

Upon completion of the teacher workshops, and a final review of the suggestions and comments provided by the workshop participants, and by the Technical and Industrial Consultants, the curriculum underwent yet another revision by the Technical Coordinator. Upon completion of this revision, the Ada curriculum was subjected to one final test by again conducting classes in cooperation with the Post-secondary Robotics/Automation Technologies program at Marion County Technical Center. Students taking part in this phase of the project included employees from participating business and industrial companies, as well as those students who were originally enrolled in the Post-secondary program. Based upon the outstandingly successful completion rate for the students who took part in this phase of the project, it is strongly felt that the resulting curriculum can provide the foundation necessary for the effective teaching of the Ada computer programming language on both the Secondary and the Post-secondary levels.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

As originally conceived, a closely related second element of this project was to educate potential employers. In particular, it was felt that, while the training of technician level employees was of the prime importance, no matter how well trained or talented the technician, that training and talent may remain unused unless the potential employers of such technicians know how to utilize that training and talent. It was, therefore, felt that an important ingredient of this project was to develop a program that would assist management level personnel in understanding computer related technologies.

In order to develop a direction of attack, the talents of a widely diverse group of consultants and advisors were employed. These included Mr. E. Robert Smith, President of J&S Machine Company who served as Industrial Liaison for this project; Dr. William Griscom, Chairman of the Division of Technology at Fairmont State College; Dr. Leonard Collelli, Vice-Chair of the same department; Mr. Ted LaRue, Associate Professor of Computer Science at Fairmont State College; Ms. Barbara Weaver, Procurement Officer, Small Business Administration; Mr. Alan Allison President, AMPS Automation, Inc.; Mr. John D. Hawkinberry, President, Hawken Associates, Inc.; and Mr. Edward E. Presley, President, Industrial Dynamics Corporation.

Through Dr. Griscom, it was learned that Carnegie-Mellon University was to offer a program specifically for the purpose of providing manager level personnel with information regarding new and emerging technologies. This program seemed almost tailor-made for the purposes of this Cooperative Demonstration Project, since the major focus was directed toward computer driven technologies. The CMU program was to be conducted via a satellite telecommunications link, and was to be offered in three segments, each of which would be approximately four hours long, spaced four weeks apart. The program was designed to show various specific applications of computer and/or microprocessor controlled systems being used in business and industry, and to provide real-time interaction, via telephone link, between participants at the various viewing sites and the panel of experts at the source of the program at CMU. It was decided to co-sponsor, in cooperation with the Division of Technology at Fairmont State College, a site for conducting this program.

The first segment of the CMU program was aired on April 11, 1990. The local program was conducted in the media room of the Library at Fairmont State College. Approximately 20 persons from business and industry participated at the local level. The response from those participants, based upon individual interviews conducted after the first session, was luke-warm. While much of the technology demonstrated during the program was highly interesting and exciting, it was felt a large gap existed when it came to translating those technologies into "bottom-line" parameters for the types of small businesses that were the

target audience for this project. Ultimately, it was learned that similar reactions must have been experienced at the majority of audience sites involved in the CMU program, because the remaining broadcasts were canceled by CMU due to the small number of participants that desired to take part.

If the broadly based approach of the CMU program failed to meet the perceived needs of management, the problem that remained was to determine the impediments that existed, and to develop a program that might eliminate some of those impediments. In order to determine the best approach to resolving this problem, the Project Coordinator and the Industrial Liaison conducted personal interviews with the management of various local firms. The two most common conclusions that were reached from these interviews were as follows:

1. A broad presentation of a wide range of computer related technologies was felt to be of little value. Most persons in management positions, rightly or wrongly, felt that they were already generally aware of such technologies. What was lacking was detailed information regarding the means of applying such technologies to specific problem areas. To paraphrase: "What exactly can it do for me now, and at a cost that our company can afford?".

2. The next most common comment could be expressed as follows: "We have spent $10,000 on computers in the past few years, and all they are, are glorified and expensive typewriters."

In retrospect, neither of these conclusions are surprising. In the day to day battle of the bottom line, taking the broad, long range view is often very difficult for managers of relatively small firms, and such firms represented the vast majority of the participating businesses. Also, most of the targeted managers matured prior to the "computer age", and were only marginally computer literate. Once these conditions were fully recognized, it was necessary to develop a new approach to helping this type of business in reaching a level of expertise whereby they are capable of utilizing such tools as the Ada programming language. It was obvious that incremental steps, rather than one giant step, presented the most viable and practical means of attaining such a goal. It was also obvious that few existing computer installations were being used to any real degree of efficiency.

Probing deeper into the reasons for the relative under-use and/or inefficient use of existing computer installations, it became almost immediately apparent that most of the individuals responsible for computer applications possessed only a very limited knowledge of the functions made available by standard Disk Operating Systems. Lack of such knowledge leads at best, to inefficiency, and at worst, to fear of computers and a reluctance to place reliance upon computer related technology. A very straight forward approach was taken to attack this problem. A curriculum was developed to teach DOS applications, and classes were offered, both on site at participating businesses, and as an evening class at Marion County Technical Center. The response from participants was universally good. Comments ranged from "I didn't know it was so simple.", to "Why weren't we taught this before?". At

first glance, it might be thought that a very basic DOS curriculum has no place in an Ada computer language curriculum. It must be remembered, however, that this project had the much broader goal, that of providing an Ada curriculum for technicians and management personnel. Since many of the target population may have little or no prior computer experience, it is essential that they be given the tools necessary for success. Among those necessary tools is an understanding of the operating system of the PC equipment that will be utilized in their training. The DOS curriculum is presented as a separate entity, to be used only where applicable.

Since it proved impractical to develop a broadly based program that would be beneficial to a wide range of the targeted businesses, it was felt that a program dedicated toward providing specific help to a group of those firms would be of value. Since many of the potential applications of Ada in industry lie in the area of computer aided design (CAD) and computer aided manufacturing (CAM) this topic was selected for exploration. In cooperation with the Technology Department of Fairmont State College, a workshop for industrial management personnel was developed. Six different firms were represented at the workshop, which was held in the Mechanical Drafting laboratory at FSC. The training session was conducted by Dr. Gerald Bacza of FSC, and was extremely well received by the participants. As a direct result of this workshop, one of the firms in attendance, Wahlco Power Products, has since entered into a joint effort with FSC to establish a computer aided design department within their organization. In addition, they have employed an advanced student from the college program on a consultant basis to assist in the optimizing of the design of some of their basic products. It was the intent of this phase of the project to demonstrate the potential for educational institutions, in particular, community colleges and/or Vocational centers, to interact with business and industry as a positive influence for economic development. Efforts such as this one can be conducted at little or no cost, while the potential benefits can mean the difference between success and failure for the participating business. Replicating this, or creating similar programs, is well within the capabilities of most technical centers or colleges. The initiative must, however, be taken by the educational institution, since businesses may be reluctant to seek assistance and, in many cases, are unaware that such assistance may be available.

SUMMARY

The state of West Virginia currently has one of the highest unemployment rates of all the states. In spite of this unfortunate circumstance, more than 80% of the participants in the Ada curriculum segment of the Robotics/Automation Technologies program at Marion County Technical Center found employment in this or closely related fields. All of the industrial participants in the curriculum are employed in this or closely related fields, and the knowledge gained will serve to further their advancement.

It is felt that the Ada curriculum developed during the course of this project forms an excellent foundation for the training of technician level personnel, or for educating management personnel in the basic features and capabilities of the Ada programming language. Technicians are expected to be capable of using computer programs on the application level, and in many cases, to be able to maintain or modify such programs to meet changing conditions. By no means is this curriculum designed or intended to produce graduates that could be considered as being Software Engineers, or even advanced programmers. The disciplines required for such individuals go far beyond the scope of this project, and beyond the scope of Secondary or Post-secondary Vocational training programs.

Educators using this curriculum to train management level personnel should be prepared to meet much the same problems which were faced during this project. Many such individuals, though capable managers, are not sufficiently computer literate to fully benefit from such training unless it is preceded by a short course in the usage of computer DOS. A curriculum for that purpose is provided as part of this project.

The compiler system used in this project was PC based, and was installed and utilized on PC equipment. This equipment was made available by the Marion County Technical Center, and by Fairmont State College. It should be noted, however, that such facilities and equipment are not always readily available. In order to fully implement this curriculum and, further, to provide for immediately available training for business and industrial personnel in this or other computer based technologies, facilities and equipment will be required. In an effort to define the specific type of facility required, and the equipment necessary to provide a wide range of such training services, Dr. William Griscom has prepared a proposal for a regional training center. The proposal is included as part of this project, and was intentionally directed toward the specific needs of the immediate region. It was felt that a realistic delineation of the required facility and equipment would be more readily assured by designing the proposal to fulfill such a specific need. It is hoped that the data provided may be extrapolated as applicable, to be of use in future planning.

Participating in this project has been a challenging but fulfilling endeavor. The interaction with our Higher Ed. participants, and with business and industry personnel has been truly rewarding. It is hoped that the product of the combined efforts of this Cooperative Demonstration Project may prove to be of value.

Respectfully submitted,

Murvyn M. McDowell,
Project Coordinator

APPENDICE D

THIRD-PARTY EVALUATION REPORT

THIRD-PARTY EVALUATION

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION

HIGH TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

CLARENCE E. BURDETTE
HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
1116 SMITH STREET
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION:

In July 1989 the Marion County Board of Education and the Kanawha County Board of Education submitted applications to the West Virginia Department of Education for submission to the U. S. Department of Education to operate demonstration programs in ADA Computer Language Training at the Marion County Vocational Technical Center and in Respiratory Therapy Technician and Hospital Pharmacy Technician at the Carver Career Center in Kanawha County.

The project was approved by the U. S. Department of Education and began operation in January 1990 for an 18-month period through June of 1991.

The project was carried out with a very high degree of consistency with the approved application. Personnel listed in the proposal were those used in the project. A high level of dedication and professionalism was demonstrated by the project personnel in carrying out the project.

ADA PROGRAMMING PROJECT
MARION COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER
FAIRMONT, WEST VIRGINIA

The ADA Language project was conceived to become a supportive element to the Software Valley project which as been operational for several years in West Virginia. The Software Valley Project was established as an economic development effort with the assistance of Senator Robert Byrd. The basic idea of this project was to encourage the development or movement of software producing companies into West Virginia. The Software Valley Project is headquartered in Morgantown, and the major impetus for the development of the project has come from the State, West Virginia University, and other colleges and universities in the State.

ADA is the major language utilized in the automation efforts of the Defense Department and many industrial firms. The ADA Language project in Marion County was seen as an effort to produce coders and/or programmers for software firms in that area who would be writing programs in the ADA language.

The project involved five major phases: 1) Design of curriculum to teach the ADA language; 2) trial operation of the curriculum; 3) Conducting workshops in ADA Language for computer teachers throughout the State; 4) Create employer awareness and involvement; and 5) legislative effort to expand the project.

Mr. Murvyn McDowell and Mr. Guy Baroni were selected as staff for the project. Both staff members were competent in the scientific, technology, and computer areas but had not had previous experience in the ADA language. Both enrolled in classes at West Virginia University concurrent with their efforts to design curriculum. Administrative and supervisory support was provided by Mr. Roger Perdue and Mr. Roman Prezioso. The project enjoyed support from the Superintendent and the Marion County Board of Education.

MAJOR PHASES OF THE PROJECT

CURRICULUM DESIGN:

The first activity of the project was to design curriculum which could be used in teaching secondary or adult students to program and code in the ADA language. The staff of the project solicited and received assistance from the Computer Science Department at West Virginia University, Fairmont State College. and from local industry. Staff from the Computer Science Department at West Virginia University and Fairmont State College were utilized on an ongoing basis as paid consultants to the project. An outline of the curriculum, instructional materials, and equipment requirements were identified and developed and are available for distribution to other institutions to implement such a program of instruction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRIAL OPERATION:

The necessary equipment and software was acquired to allow students to try out and run programs designed in the ADA language. Trial efforts with the curriculum were made in the secondary automated metalworking program in the Marion County Center. Adult students, many of whom work in local industry, were recruited and a class started during the evening hours. Many of the students in the classes were also involved in classes in electrical controls, electronic/robotics, and metalworking/machine shop.

A major question relative to the teaching of ADA has been -- Can secondary level or adult students who do not have significant pre-requisites in mathematics be taught to program and code in ADA?

The trial operation phase of this class would tend to indicate that these students can be taught ADA language providing their academic and technical background and capability is sufficient.

The curriculum developed earlier has been utilized in these classes and has undergone continuous revision as the need for change has been indicated.

ADA Language instruction will continue as a part of the adult education program at the Marion County Center and will be implemented as possible into the high school program. A total of 30 high school and adult students received training in ADA as a part of this project. Opportunities will be available for employment of these persons or for upgrading the employment level of those already employed.

A survey/evaluation form was administered to the students in the ADA language in an effort to obtain their reaction to the program. Data from that survey is found in the appendix.

TEACHER WORKSHOPS:

One of the purposes of the project was to disseminate information relating to the teaching of the ADA Language throughout the State. To accomplish this, three workshops were held primarily for computer programming teachers in the State designed to make them comfortable with the ADA language, to provide them with information regarding the curriculum and equipment neeeded to teach ADA, and to provide them with basic instruction and experience in ADA programming. These workshops were intended to make teachers comfortable with the ADA language and not to make them experts.

Three workshops were held -- two at Fairmont State College and one at the West Virginia Institute of Technology. The workshops appear to have been very successful. A summary of the responses to the evaluation instrument may be found in the appendix.

A major concern of those persons participating in the workshops was obtaining funding necessary to buy the computers, etc. needed for the ADA language.

Those teachers who had experience in programming in the PASCALE language seemed to have little difficulty transferring their knowledge and learning ADA programming. There was a feeling on the part of most teachers that the PASCALE language should be taught as a preliminary or at the beginning of the ADA language class.

CREATE EMPLOYER AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT:

Significant efforts were made to involve employers to create awareness of the potential usage of the ADA language with employers and to involve them in this project. Employers, however, tend to react to present needs rather than to prepare for their future needs and to make their companies capable of becoming in new processes and products.

A seminar for industry personnel was conducted to familiarize key personnel to the language. While some employers recognized the advantage of being capable to use ADA, many employers shrugged off the need for becoming involved because of the lack of current need for training or for employing personnel capable of ADA programming. This attitude seems to be born out by the lack of return of questionnaires to industry in the area and advisory council members from the program.

A copy of the survey form which was mailed appears in the appendix. A copy of the one form returned is found in the appendix.

Perhaps the interest level and involvement of employers will increase as the Software Valley Project matures and the need for ADA programming in various projects is demonstrated.

STATE INVOLVEMENT:

The staff of the project and the administration of the Marion County Center, with encouragement from those persons involved in the project, initiated an effort in the West Virginia Legislature to provide for the expansion of ADA language training in the State. A bill was introduced into the WV House of Delegates which would have provided funding for the necessary equipment and software to initiate the program and for the training of instructors which would have expanded the program into each region of the State. While there was significant interest on the part of the House Education Committee and other delegates and there was significant support of the idea, the bill failed to pass.

It is anticipated that this effort will be made again in the coming session of the Legislature, and it is hoped that a more favorable consideration of the bill will be obtained.

SUMMARY

This project was well conceived and well operated by the staff and administration in Marion County and was enthusiastically received by those persons who attended the workshops.

Beyond the intitial preparation of the project, the project was verbally supported by the State Department of Education but did not enjoy the active participation or enthusiastic support of State department staff. State staff did not participate in the curriculum design nor the planning or carrying out of the dissemination workshops. A high level of interest and participation would be necessary to the expansion of this program throughout the State.

RESPIRATORY THERAPY TECHNICIAN
CARVER CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

The Respiratory Therapy Technician program operated as a part of this project at the Carver Career and Technical Education Center was very successful. The success of the project was due to excellent planning and a commitment on the part of the administrative staff at Carver, good relationships with the health care industry in the area, the identification of the need based upon data provided by the health care industry, involvement of those persons responsible for respiratory therapy in the area hospitals, and a commitment from hospital administrators and supervisory personnel.

A professional instructional staff who possessed a high level of expertise in respiratory therapy was recruited for the program. This staff was very highly commited to the success of the program and worked diligently to bring about that success.

The advisory committee for the program met regularly and contributed significantly to the design and organization of the class.

CURRICULUM

A survey of clinical supervisors and employers indicates a very high degree of appropriateness of the curriculum taught for the job for which the training is offered. Students, teachers, and administrators were also in agreement on this point. The students also gave very high ratings to the adequacy of the clinical experience provided and the educational value of that experience.

Students also felt very strongly that the class provided an excellent background to them for furthering their education or improving their position and skill following employment. Some students indicated they already had been employed and most all students felt strongly that employment in the field was highly probable. Employers also indicated a high level of expectation for employing graduates of the program.

One frequently made comment by students was that the program of study should be longer. Students also indicated in comments the need for improved facilities and equipment. Students, teachers, administrators, clinical supervisors, and employers all strongly agreed that the program should be continued. Summary tables for the surveys and questionnaires are found in the appendix.

The decision was made early in the program to seek national accreditation from Joint Review Committee for Respiratory Therapy Education, and the curriculum recommended by this accrediting group was utilized as the basic instructional program for the class. Some modifications were necessary to meet the local needs and conditions. While accreditation has not yet been awarded, all of the necessary work for accreditation has been completed and accreditation is anticipated.

Students were recruited and screened utilizing a testing process and personal interviews. One weakness of the program which has been agreed upon by all of the staff and advisors associated with the propgram was the inappropriateness of the test used. That weakness will be corrected for future classes.

OPERATION OF CLASS

The program is an 11-month adult level course which operates from 2:30 - 8:30 p.m. five days a week. Thirty-three students were enrolled, nine dropped from the program, with 24 students completing the first year. Reasons given for the nine dropouts were lack of interest, aptitude in the occupation and/or lack of educational background, and family problems.

Combination of this program at Carver reduces the amount of time required for the associate degree program to approximately one year at the University of Charleston. An articulation agreement is in place with the University of Charleston which allows completers of the program to have credit in the associate degree program in respiratory therapy at the University of Charleston.

A major strength of this program was the utilization of classroom training and practical on-the-job training and experience. The on-the-job training was under the direct supervision of identified clinical supervisors in the hospitals. Information obtained from survey forms indicate a high level of correlation between the classroom instruction and the practical on-the-job training phase.

DISSEMINATION AND STATE INVOLVEMENT

Information relative to this new program area was disseminated to other county vocational directors through a presentation by the principal, Norma Miller, at a statewide meeting of vocational directors and supervisors. Others have been invited to schedule visitations to the program for informational and dissemination purposes.

The state supervisor for health occupations was involved in the program through serving on its advisory committee and in occasional visits and discussions with the program administrative staff.

It appears that a program of this type, properly planned and with health care provider input and cooperation, could be successful in other areas of the state.

HOSPITAL PHARMACY TECHNICIAN
CARVER CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

The Hospital Pharmacy Technician program at the Carver Career and Technical Education Center was developed utilizing an advisory committee of 12 members representing the pharmacy directors of area hospitals and major retail pharmacies in the area. The curriculum for the course and operational approach of the course was developed utilizing the input of this committee.

The program involves both classroom work, observation, and on-the-job training. The duration of the Pharmacy Technician program is approximately 5-1/2 months and operates six hours per day, five days per week. Two classes have been enrolled and completed. In the first class, eight students were enrolled, two dropped, and six completed. The second class enrolled 21 students, three dropped, and 18 completed. Significant employment opportunities appear to exist as described with discussions with advisory committee members and the instructor. It is anticipated that a high percentage of those completing have been or will be employed in the field.

One significant problem area for this program has been pointed out by the Executive Director of the WV Pharmacy Association. The law governing pharmacy and the rules of the WV Board of Pharmacy do not specifically identify professional duties and functions that are the sole responsibility of pharmacists nor do they identify those duties and functions which can be performed by ancillary pharmacy personnel.

The Executive Director pointed out that the association does recognize the inadequacy of the present law and has appointed a special committee to study and make recommedations on the isue of duties and responsibilities of both. The association intends to then make recommendations to the Board of Pharmacy regarding the definition of "pharmacy technician" and those specific duties which may be assigned to a technician. They indicate that they believe that the pharmacist will still be held legally and professionally responsible. The administration of the Carver Career and Technical Education Center apparently will join the pharmacy association in an effort to obtain such definition. One possibility would be the development of licensing requirements for pharmacy technicians which would include educational requirements.

It appears that there is a need to define pharmacy technician in law or regulations and to define required training for the position in view of the fact that almost all pharmacies, both hospital and retail, now utilize an assistant of some kind to the pharmacist in performing their job. The determination has been made that this practice is not illegal. There is simply a void in defining and describing the legal aspects of such ancillary personnel.

If law or policy of the Pharmacy Board were to be implemented requiring a certain educational program as a pre-requisite for employment as a pharmacy technician, then this course would undoubtedly be considered the forerunner and should be looked at carefully in designing curriculum and requirements for the pharmacy technician.

I would anticipate also that several additional pharmacy technician programs would be developed in various locations in the state.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum for this course was developed and modeled after the recommended curriculum of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists. That curriculum was modified in accordance with recommendations from the advisory committee.

Tables are found in the appendix which give average rating to survey questions administered to students, advisory committee members, employers, teachers, clinical supervisors, and administrators.

Advisory committee members and employers believe the course should be contined but that there is a need for an instructional pharmacy laboratory in the school which can be utilized as a part of the program. They indicate excellent opportunities for employment and satisfaction with the curriculum and operation of the program.

Students gave the program very high ratings. They also indicate the need for a practice pharmacy lab within the school. Several suggested lengthening the course. Survey forms for teachers, clinical supervisors and administrators also recognized the need for a practice pharmacy lab within the school, the need to change WV pharmacy laws, and for recognition from the board of pharmacy and improvement in the screening mechanism for selecting students for the class.

Overall ratings obtained from the questionnaires, however, are very high. This exemplary program seems to have stimulated discussion relating to the legal aspects of the pharmacy technician and will probably result in significant changes in the operation of pharmacies within the state. It appears to have satisfied a significant need.

COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

A P P E N D I X

ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE TRAINING

MARION COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER, FAIRMONT, WEST VIRGINIA

HRDTI, Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Student:

The class you have attended or are attending for the ADA Computer Language at the Marion County Career Education Center has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education to provide needed technical level training. This class has been operated in cooperation with Fairmont State College, West Virginia University and others.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

2. Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

6. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

7. Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is time for individual study provided for students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60% ___ 60-70% ___ 70-80% ___ 80-90% ___ 90-100% ___

13. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____

_____

_____

14. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

15. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

16. What changes in the program would you recommend?

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

ADA Computer Language

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

2. To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

3. To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

4. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

   _____
   _____
   _____

5. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

   _____
   _____
   _____

6. Do you believe this program should be continued?

   YES ____ NO ____

7. What changes in the program would you recommend?

   _____
   _____
   _____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE

1. How long were you/have you been enrolled in this class>? _____

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

2. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

6. Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

7. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field>

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level:

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____

_____

_____

13. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____

_____

_____

14. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

15. Would you recommend this program to a friend or relative?

YES ____ NO ____

16. What changes in the progam would you recommend?

_____

_____

_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE

COMPOSITE SCORES

N = 8

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	4.0
Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?	4.57
Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?	5.0
Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.87
Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?	4.75
Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?	4.25
Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?	4.75
Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?	4.75
Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field?	3.88
Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level:	4.63

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 8 NO 0

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

ADA COMPUTER LANGUAGE N = 5 AVG.SCORE

How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class? 3.8

Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate? 4.0

Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program? 4.6

Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered? 4.6

Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class? 4.4

Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used? 3.2

Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students? 4.4

Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level? 4.6

Is time for individual study provided for students? 4.4

To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program? 4.0

To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program? 3.6

What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60%	___	80-90%	___
60-70%	2	90-100%	3

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 4 NO ___
(one did not answer)

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

ADA Computer Language

N = 1

How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class? N/A

To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered? 5

To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class? 5

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 1 NO ____

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

ADA Computer Language

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: N/A

2. To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

(5) 4 3 2 1

Comment: Courses designed to the audience

3. To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?

(5) 4 3 2 1

Comment: We attempt to place students in jobs directly related to their training.

4. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

Individualized training on a flexible schedule. Can come and go as time permits, today or tomorrow and still get credit.

5. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

Location. The class should be moved to a site where it could receive such as equipment.

6. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES X NO ___

7. What changes in the program would you recommend?

The program needs more publicity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADA WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

N = 28

Overall, how would you rate the quality of the workshop?	4.6
How would you rate the quality of instruction?	4.61
How would you rate the quality of equipment/software used for instruction?	4.6
Of what quality were the hands-on exercises?	4.4
How would you rate the organization of the workshop, i.e. time, correspondence, etc?	4.6

FEEDBACK/INDUSTRIAL TRAINING SEMINAR - ADA

N = 10

Overall how would you rate the quality of the workshop?	4.3
How would you rate the quality of instruction?	4.6
How helpful in your job will the information presented during the workshops be?	3.8
Of what quality were the hands-on exercises?	4.2
How would you rate the organization of the workshop, i.e. time, corrrespondence, etc?	4.3

RESPIRATORY THERAPY TECHNICIAN

CARVER CAREER CENTER, CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

HRDTI, Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

Dear Student:

The class you have attended or are attending for Respiratory Therapy Technician at the Carver Tech Center has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Teacher or Administrator:

The class you are teaching or have taught for Respiratory Therapy Technicians at the Carver Tech Center has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Supervisor:

You have been providing clinical supervision for students who are attending or have attended a class at the Carver Tech Center for Respiratory Therapy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Employer:

The Carver Career and Technical Education Center has been conducting a class for Respiratory Therapy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI, Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Advisory Committee Member:

You have been serving as a member of the Advisory Committee for a class at the Carver Tech Center for Respiratory Therapy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training,

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

_____
Name of Class

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

2. To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

3. Does the class include adequate clinical experience?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

4. To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

5. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

   _____
   _____
   _____

6. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

   _____
   _____
   _____

7. Do you believe this program should be continued?

   YES ____ NO ____

8. What changes in the program would you recommend?

   _____
   _____
   _____

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS, CLINICAL SUPERVISORS,
AND ADMINISTRATORS

_____
Name of Class

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

2. Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

6. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

7. Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. Are clinical experiences adequate for the provision of practical learning?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

13. Is time for individual study provided for students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

14. To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

15. To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

16. What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60% ___ 60-70% ___ 70-80% ___ 80-90% __ 90-100% ___

17. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____
_____
_____

18. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____
_____
_____

19. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

20. What changes in the program would you recommend?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

_____
Name of Class

1. How long were you/have you been enrolled in this class>? _____

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

2. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

6. Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

7. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. Are you provided adequate clinical experience?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

13. Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

14. Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field>

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

15. Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level:

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

16. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____
_____
_____

17. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____
_____
_____

18. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

19. Would you recommend this program to a friend or relative?

YES ____ NO ____

20. What changes in the program would you recommend?

_____
_____
_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPIRATORY THERAPY TECHNICIAN
(Composite Score)

N = 22

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	3.10
Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?	3.68
Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?	3.27
Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.5
Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?	3.68
Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?	4.05
Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?	2.86
Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?	3.40
Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?	3.95
Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?	3.45
Are you provided adequate clinical experience?	4.40
Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?	4.31
Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field?	4.64
Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level?	4.5

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 21 NO 1

Would you recommend this program to a friend or relative?

YES 21 NO 1

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

RESPIRATORY THERAPY TECHNICIAN
(Composite Score)

N = 8

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	3.62
To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.87
Does the class include adequate clinical experience?	5.0
To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?	4.5

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 8 NO ____

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS, CLINICAL SUPERVISORS,
AND ADMINISTRATORS

RESPIRATORY THERAPY
(Composite Score)

N = 5

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	3.2
Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate?	4.4
Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program?	4.0
Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	5.1
Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?	4.6
Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used?	4.8
Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students?	5.0
Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?	5.0
Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?	4.25
Are clinical experiences adequate for the provision of practical learning?	5.0
Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?	4.8
Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level?	1.8
Is time for individual study provided for students?	4.25
To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program?	3.4
To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program?	4.25

What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60%		80-90%	1
60-70%		90-100%	3
70-80%	1		

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 5 NO 0

HOSPITAL PHARMACY TECHNICIAN

CARVER CAREER CENTER, CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Teacher or Administrator:

The class you are teaching or have taught for Hospital Pharmacy Technicians at the Carver Tech Center has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Student:

The class you have attended or are attending for Hospital Pharmacy Technician at the Carver Tech Center has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Supervisor:

You have been providing clinical supervision for students who are attending or have attended a class at the Carver Tech Center for Hospital Pharmacy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Employer:

The Carver Career and Technical Education Center has been conducting a class for Hospital Pharmacy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

HRDTI,Inc.

Human Resources Development and Training International, Inc.

1116 Smith St., Suite 111, Charleston, West Virginia 25301

304/340-4256
FAX 304/340-4275

June 10, 1991

Dear Advisory Committee Member:

You have been serving as a member of the Advisory Committee for a class at the Carver Tech Center for Hospital Pharmacy Technicians which has been operated under a special grant from the U. S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the West Virginia Department of Education, to provide needed technical level training.

To determine whether or not the training is appropriate and realistic in terms of the job and whether or not the opportunities exist for employment for persons who have completed the class, will you please take the time to check this questionnaire giving us your opinion about various aspects of this class.

We value your opinions highly and the completion of the survey form is important for the continuation of the class and for making changes in future classes which might improve the training.

You need not identify yourself. All information obtained will be confidential and used only for the purposes stated.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Clarence E. Burdette

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

_____
Name of Class

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

2. To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Does the class include adequate clinical experience?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____
_____
_____

6. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____
_____
_____

7. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

8. What changes in the program would you recommend?

_____
_____
_____

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS, CLINICAL SUPERVISORS,
AND ADMINISTRATORS

Name of Class _____

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

1. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

2. Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

3. Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

4. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

5. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

6. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used?

   5 4 3 2 1

   Comment: _____

7. Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. Are clinical experiences adequate for the provision of practical learning?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

13. Is time for individual study provided for students?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

14. To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

15. To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

16. What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60% ___ 60-70% ___ 70-80% ___ 80-90% __ 90-100% ___

17. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____
_____
_____

18. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____
_____
_____

19. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ___ NO ___

20. What changes in the program would you recommend?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

_____
Name of Class

1. How long were you/have you been enrolled in this class>? _____

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING FROM 5 - 1. (5 is the highest - 1 is the lowest)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE)

2. How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

3. Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

4. Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

5. Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

6. Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

7. Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

8. Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

9. Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

10. Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

11. Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

12. Are you provided adequate clinical experience?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

13. Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

14. Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field>

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

15. Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level:

5 4 3 2 1

Comment: _____

16. What do you consider the strongest part of this program?

_____
_____
_____

17. What do you consider the weakest part of the program?

_____
_____
_____

18. Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES ____ NO ____

19. Would you recommend this program to a friend or relative?

YES ____ NO ____

20. What changes in the program would you recommend?

_____
_____
_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HOSPITAL PHARMACY TECHNICIAN
(Composite Score)

N = 16

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	3.62
Did you understand the requirements and rules of the program when you enrolled?	4.68
Are the rules fairly and objectively applied by the staff and administrators?	4.12
Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.62
Is instruction in class clear and easy to understand and to follow?	4.56
Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?	4.37
Are evaluations, tests and quizzes fair and appropriate?	4.56
Is the grading for the class fair and appropriate?	4.68
Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?	3.93
Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?	4.31
Are you provided adequate clinical experience?	4.25
Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?	4.37
Do you expect to or have you become employed in this field?	4.0
Has this class provided you with appropriate background to assist you in furthering your education or to improve your position or skill level?	4.68

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 16 NO 0

Would you recommend this program to a friend or relative?

YES 13 NO 3

QUESTIONNAIRE
ADVISORY COMMITTEES & EMPLOYERS

HOSPITAL PHARMACY TECHNICIAN
(Composite Score)

N = 5

	AVG. SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	4.2
To what degree is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.2
Does the class include adequate clinical experience?	4.4
To what degree are employment opportunities available to completers of this class?	4.4

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 5 NO 0

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS, CLINICAL SUPERVISORS,
AND ADMINISTRATORS

HOSPITAL PHARMACY TECHNICIAN
(Composite Score)

N = 5

	AVG.SCORE
How well do you feel that the criteria for admission to the class relates to a student's potential success in the class?	3.8
Are the rules, requirements and regulations for the program appropriate?	4.0
Have students routinely followed the rules, regulations, and administrative requirements of the program?	4.2
Is the subject matter appropriate for the job for which the training is offered?	4.2
Are appropriate instructional and reference materials provided and available for the class?	4.0
Are evaluations, tests and quizzes regularly used?	4.25
Is a grading system used which regularly provides written grades or evaluations to the students?	4.3
Is the classroom instruction and the clinical practice appropriately coordinated?	3.8
Is the time allocation between classroom instruction, study time, and clinical practice appropriate?	3.6
Are clinical experiences adequate for the provision of practical learning?	3.6
Are clinical experience assignments made primarily for educational value?	4.0
Does this class provide students with appropriate background to assist them in further education to improve their position or skill level?	3.8
Is time for individual study provided for students?	4.0
To what degree are the facilities adequate for the program?	3.2
To what extent are equipment and supplies adequate for the program?	3.0

What percent of the completers do you expect to become employed?

50-60%	___	80-90%	3
60-70%	___	90-100%	___
70-80%	2		

Do you believe this program should be continued?

YES 5 NO 0

APPENDICE E

SURVEY INFORMATION REPORT

TO WESTAT CORPORATION

West Virginia Department of
Education
Charleston, West Virginia

U199A00075 38

Form Approved
OMB Number: 1875-0081
Expiration Date: 12/31/91

**AN EVALUATION OF THE
COOPERATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM
(HIGH TECHNOLOGY)**

PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary
Washington, D.C. 20202

The project had three different instructional programs at two subcontract sites. Some parts of this report are by site. (K) means Carver Vo-Tech Center in Kanawha County and (M) means Marion County Vo-Tech Center.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, 1875-NEW, Washington, D.C. 20503.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General Instructions: This questionnaire requests information about the activities, outcomes, and expenditures of the project funded by the Cooperative Demonstration Program (High Technology). Throughout the questionnaire, the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant will be referred to as the "project." The questionnaire should be completed by the person with responsibility for the management and daily administration of the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE PAGE THAT CORRESPONDS TO THE ANSWER YOU HAVE SELECTED.

Changes in Economic Conditions

1. Since you applied for the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant, how have economic conditions in your community changed? (Circle one)

Improved	1
Deteriorated	2
Remained about the same	(3) (SKIP TO Q.3)

2. How did the change affect the implementation of the project?

Please describe. _____

_____

3. Since you applied for the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant, how have economic conditions changed in the industry/occupation in which training was provided? (Circle one)

Improved	1
Deteriorated	2
Remained about the same	(3) (SKIP TO Q.5)

4. How did the change affect the implementation of the project?

Please describe. _____

_____

Goals

5. What is the relative importance of the following possible goals for your project? Please rank in order of importance in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

3	Increase access to vocational training for special, or otherwise underserved, populations	1
2	Establish public/private partnerships	2
1	Create new or improved type of training	3
_____	Other (SPECIFY) _____	4

_____

6. What are the most important activities of the project? Please circle as many as three responses and rank by order of importance in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

____	Student recruitment	1
____	Student assessment	2
1	Student training	(3)
____	Staff development	4
____	Job skills identification	5
2	Curriculum development	(6)
3	Dissemination of project model, methods, or products	(7)
4	Job placement	(8)
____	Other (SPECIFY)_____	9

_____

7. For which of the following industries did the project prepare students? (Circle all that apply)

Construction	1	
Agriculture	2	
Manufacturing	(3)	(M)
Transportation and public utilities	4	
Wholesale or retail trade	5	
Finance, insurance, or real estate	6	
Business services	7	
Health care	(8)	(K)
Education	9	
Communications	10	
Multiple industries	11	
Other (SPECIFY)_____	12	

_____

8. Was the training designed to help students develop skills for entry-level work or to upgrade their skills for higher-level work? (Circle one)

Develop skills for entry-level work	1
Upgrade skills	2
Both	(3)
Not applicable	4

9. Was the project's training an additional part or improvement of an ongoing training program, or was it a separate training effort? (Circle one)

Part of an ongoing training program	(1)	(M)
Separate training program	(2)	(K)
Other (SPECIFY)_____	3	

10. Did the project benefit a new or different group of clients than the grantee institution served previously? (Circle one)

Benefits a new or different group	(1)	(K)
Benefits a similar group as served previously	2	
Benefits both new and similar groups	(3)	(M)

11. Please describe the group of clients served by the project.

(K) 34 Respiratory and 29 Pharmacy Technician Trainees - all adults

(M) 9 Adults in ADA program, 15 adults and 3 employers in Intro. DOS, 30 teachers in ADA workshop, 7 staff and 31 employers in ADA manager workshops.

12. What important features of your project do you believe have applicability to, or provide useful models for, other educational or employment training programs? Below are a series of statements about project features. Select as many as three statements and rank them according to importance in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

2	The project developed a new or improved curriculum	(1)	(M)
1	The project provided a new or improved kind of training	(2)	
3	The project established or strengthened public-private partnerships	(3)	
4	The project applied high technology equipment to the delivery of training	(4)	
____	The project expanded access to vocational training for disadvantaged or under-represented population groups	5	
____	The project implemented a more effective model of school-to-work transition for students	6	
5	The project provided customized training (for a particular employer or group of employers)	(7)	
____	Other (SPECIFY) _____	8	

13. Which of the following statements best exemplifies the high technology focus of your project? (Circle all that apply)

Training was designed to prepare students for jobs in fields that manufacture high tech products or service high tech equipment	(1)	(M)
Training was designed to enable the students to use high techequipment or products even though the field in which the equipment is used is not generally considered high tech	(3)	(K)
Training was conducted on high tech equipment, such as computers, CAD, or CIM equipment	(4)	(M)
Training was offered in basic skills as preparation for specific occupational training in a high tech field	5	
Other (SPECIFY)_____	6	

Planning

14. In relation to the beginning of the Federal grant, when did the project start to provide direct services to clients? (Circle one)

Direct services were already being provided to clients prior to the start of the grant	1
Direct services began the same time the grant started	2
One to three months after grant started	3
Four to six months after grant started	4
Seven to nine months after grant started	(5)
Ten to 12 months after grant started	6
Thirteen or more months after grant started	7

15. Did the project continue after the expiration of the Federal grant? (Circle one)

Yes, in its entirety	(1)	
Yes, in scaled-down form	2	
No	3	(SKIP TO Q.17)

16. If the project continued beyond the Federal grant period, what are the sources of financial or in-kind support for which you have applied? (Circle only those that will provide at least one-quarter of the necessary funds. Please check whether funds from the source are pending or are already committed.)

		Pending	Committed
The grantee institution or school district	1		
Private foundation	2		
Other Federal grant	(3)		✓
State or local government categorical grant	(4)		✓
Private employer	5		
Non-profit community agency	6		
Funds from sales of project products	7		
Employer or trade association	8	✓	
Union	9		
Other (SPECIFY)_____	10		

_____

17. Would this project have existed if it had not received the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant? (Circle one)

Yes 1
No ..... (2) (SKIP TO Q.18)

If "Yes," which specific activities have occurred as a result of these Federal funds? (Circle all that apply)

Student recruitment 1
Student assessment 2
Student training 3
Staff development 4
Job skills identification 5
Curriculum development 6
Dissemination of project model, methods, or products 7
Job placement 8
Other (SPECIFY)_____ 9

_____

18. Was student training a major part of your project?

Yes ..... (1)

No ..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.19)

If "Yes," a number of steps may have occurred before the training began. Please circle the activities below that occurred as part of the preparation for training, and estimate in the column on the right the total staff hours devoted to each circled activity up to now. (Circle all that apply)

		Number of staff hours
Refining or specifying in more detail the skills or job training needed in a particular field or geographic area	(1)	245
Developing instruments or other student assessment techniques and materials	(2)	100
Reviewing, adopting, or adapting curriculum materials or assessment mechanisms from other sources	(3)	733
Commissioning reviews of planned offerings by experts, potential employers, or institutional officials	(4)	50
Obtaining the necessary approvals to offer training or to prepare students for licensure from institutions, government agencies, or licensure boards	(5)	120
Recruiting/hiring staff	(6)	50
Recruiting students	(7)	150
Contracting for training Clinical	(8)	100
Recruiting employers interested in having employees trained or in hiring students	(9)	200
Training instructional staff	(10)	75
Other (SPECIFY) _____	11	

19. Was the development of a new curriculum a major activity of your project? (Circle one)

Yes ..... (1) (M)

No ..... (2) (SKIP TO Q.20) (K)

If "Yes," were any of the following steps taken? (Circle all that apply)

Worked with private industry to identify training needs and skill requirements	(1)
Designed the curriculum structure and content	(2)
Pretested and revised the curriculum	(3)
Gained industry or union approval of the curriculum	(4)
Other (SPECIFY) _____	5
_____	

20. Did the project offer (or coordinate with another entity to deliver) support services to students?

Yes	(1)
No	2 (SKIP TO Q.21)

If "Yes," which of the following support services were provided to students? Circle all that apply. Please check the appropriate space to indicate whether the delivered service was offered directly by the project or provided by another agency (in or out of the grantee institution) under project coordination.

		Offered	Coordinated
Academic or vocational assessment	1		
Academic remediation	2		
Tutoring	3		
English-as-a-Second-Language	4		
Child care	5		
Stipends or other financial aid	6		
Transportation assistance	7		
Career or other counseling	8		
Health care or referrals	9		
Employability advice	10	✓	✓
Job fairs	11		
Job placement	12	✓	✓
Other (Specify)_____			
_____			

21. Did the project provide training? (Circle one)

Yes	(1)
No	2 (SKIP TO Q.23)

22. How many students were enrolled in training? Please provide head count and full time equivalent (FTE) enrollment figures as available.

Head count enrollment 72

FTE enrollment ..... 55 Completers
8 FIE Partial P

Student Characteristics

23. What was the total number of students in the grantee's district, at the secondary level, or post-secondary institution? ..... 291 Adult Prep (K)
94 Adult Prep (M)

Please complete Table 1 (on next page) regarding the characteristics of the students served by your project.

Student Recruitment

24. Were extra efforts made to recruit students from special population groups?

Yes 1
No ..... (2) (SKIP TO Q.26)

If "Yes," for which of the following groups were these efforts made? (Circle all that apply)

Women 1
Blacks, not of Hispanic origin 2
Hispanics 3
Asian or Pacific Islanders 4
American Indians or Alaskan Natives 5
Persons with disabilities 6
Immigrants (non-U.S. citizens born outside the U.S.) 7
Low-income persons (annual family income below $13,400) 8
Unemployed persons 9
Academically disadvantaged students (reading below 8th grade level) 10
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 11

_____

Table 1. Student characteristics

TOTAL

Please provide the following information for students in the Cooperative Demonstration project.

		Number of students served by the project
Total number of students served by the project		72
Sex:	Male	22
	Female	50
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Age:	< 18	0
	18-22	14
	23-29	23
	30-39	25
	40+	10
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Race:	White, not of Hispanic origin	66
	Black, not of Hispanic origin	6
	Hispanic	
	Asian or Pacific Islander	
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
English proficiency:		
	English proficient	72
	Limited English proficient	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Special populations:		
	Students with disabilities	0
	Immigrant (non-U.S. citizen born outside the U.S.)	0
	Low-income (annual family income below $13,400)	
	Academically disadvantaged students (reading below 8th grade level)	0
	Unemployed	
	No special circumstances	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72 / 72
Educational attainment:		
	Some high school	0
	High school graduate or GED	52
	Some college	18
	College graduate	2
	Unknown	
	Total*	72
Primary educational or vocational goal:		
	Job placement	2
	Job promotion	5
	Vocational certification	65
	High school diploma or GED	
	College credit or CEU's	
	Associate's degree	
	Other (SPECIFY)_____	
	Unknown	
	Total*	72

*Total should equal the total number of students served by the project.

Table 1. Student characteristics (continued)

	Number of students served by the project
Number of hours of instruction received by students from the project during the grant period:	
1-100 hours	10
101-250 hours	10
251-500 hours	3
501-750 hours	25
751-1000 hours	
1000 or more hours	24
Unknown	
Total	72
Type of instruction received (describe):	
Classroom - Laboratory	72
Clinical	59
Total	72
Other services (describe):	
Counseling, Testing, Placement	72
Total	72
Number for whom training continued after the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant ended	1
Employment status at the time of training:	
Full-time	24
Part-time	9
Unemployed	39
Unknown	
Total*	72
For those employed, the number who are employed by:	
Partner organization	13
Non-partner	9
Grantee institution	1
Unknown other	10
Total	33
Training status at end of grant period:	
Currently enrolled	1
Successfully completed	55
Failed	1
Dropped out	15
Unknown	
Total	72
For those who were trained, the number who were:	
Referred to employers	7
Hired	35
Promoted	1
Continued with education	7
Other (SPECIFY) Dropped Out	16
Unknown	6
Total	72

*Total should equal the total number of students served by the project.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	9
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	
Sex:	
Male	7
Female	2
Total	9
Age:	
<18	0
18–22	4
23–29	4
30–39	1
40+	0
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	9
Race:	
White	9
Black	0
Hispanic	0
Asian	0
Other	0
Total	9
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	9
Limited English Proficient	0
Total	9
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	
	0
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	0
12 years	2
13–15 years	5
16 years or more	2
Total	9
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	2
Job Promotion	5
Vocational Certification	2
High School Diploma or GED	0
College Credit or CEU's	0
Associate's Degree	0
Total	9

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1A , (Continued)

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1–100	6
101–250	3
251–500	0
501–750	0
751–1000	0
1000 or more	0
Total	9
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Introductory Hands-on Programming in the ADA Programming Language	9
Total	9
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling	9
Job Placement	4
Total	9
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	1
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	
Full Time	7
Part Time	1
Unemployed	1
Total	9
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	3
Non-Partner	4
Grantee Institution	0
Other	1
Total	8
Training Status:	
Enrolled	9
Successfully Completed	8
Unsuccessfully Completed	-
Did Not Complete	1
Total	9
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	3
Hired	3
Promoted	1
Other	5
Total	9

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	34
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	778
Sex:	
Male	10
Female	24
Total	34
Age:	
<18	
18–22	3
23–29	13
30–39	13
40+	5
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	34
Race:	
White	31
Black	3
Hispanic	
Asian	
Other	
Total	34
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	34
Limited English Proficient	
Total	34
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	
	0
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	~~27~~
12 years	27 →
13–15 years	7
16 years or more	
Total	34
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	
Job Promotion	
Vocational Certification	34
High School Diploma or GED	
College Credit or CEU's	
Associate's Degree	
Total	34

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1B, (Continued)

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1–100	2
101–250	5
251–500	1
501–750	2
751–1000	
1000 or more	24
Total	34
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Classroom Laboratory	34
Clinical	34
Total	34
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling, testing, placement	34
Total	34
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	0
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	
Full Time	16
Part Time	4
Unemployed	14
Total	34
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	10
Non-Partner	
Grantee Institution	1
Other	9
Total	20
Training Status:	
Enrolled	34
Successfully Completed	24
Unsuccessfully Completed	
Did Not Complete	10
Total	34
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	
Hired	21
Promoted	
Other	13
Total	34

TABLE 1C Kanawha County

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Please provide the following information for students in the cooperative demonstration project.

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Total number of students in COOP Demo	29
Total number of students in Grantee's general population	778
Sex:	
Male	5
Female	24
Total	29
Age:	
<18	0
18–22	7
23–29	6
30–39	11
40+	5
Total* (all totals should equal the total number of students in the COOP Demo project as completed above)	29
Race:	
White	26
Black	3
Hispanic	0
Asian	0
Other	0
Total	29
English Proficiency:	
English Proficient	29
Limited English Proficient	
Total	29
Handicapping Conditions (describe):	
Total	0
Educational Attainment:	
<12th Grade	
12 years	23
13–15 years	6
16 years or more	
Total	29
Educational or Vocational Goal:	
Job Placement	
Job Promotion	
Vocational Certification	29
High School Diploma or GED	
College Credit or CEU's	
Associate's Degree	
Total	29

* NOTE: Totals should equal the total number in 1st block.

TABLE 1C, (Continued)

	Students Participating in Cooperative Demonstration
Number of Hours of Instruction Received from the Project:	
1-100	2
101-250	2
251-500	2
501-750	654 23
751-1000	
1000 or more	
Total	654 29
Type of Instruction Received (describe):	
Classroom (Didactic)	
Clinical Rotation	414 29
	240 25
Total	654 29
Other Services (describe):	
Counseling, testing, placement	29
Total	29
Number for Whom Training Continued after Project Ended	0
Employment Status at the Time of Training:	
Full Time	1
Part Time	4
Unemployed	24
Total	29
For Those Employed, the Number who are Employed by:	
Partner Organization	
Non-Partner	5
Grantee Institution	
Other	
Total	5
Training Status:	
Enrolled	29
Successfully Completed	23
Unsuccessfully Completed	1
Did Not Complete	5
Total	29
For Those who were Trained, the Number who were:	
Referred	4
Hired	11
Promoted	
Other	13
Total	29

25. If extra efforts were made to recruit special population groups, which of the following methods were used? Circle all that apply. Please rank in order of importance in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

_____ Distributed posters, flyers, or other materials..... 1
_____ Generated newspaper/magazine articles..... 2
_____ Advertised in print or broadcast media..... 3
_____ Solicited coverage in broadcast media..... 4
_____ Contacted community groups..... 5
_____ Contacted employers, employer associations, or unions..... 6
_____ Contacted organizations serving/advocating the disabled..... 7
_____ Recruited internally within grantee institution/district..... 8
_____ Contacted other educational institutions..... 9
_____ Contacted government offices (including PICs and employment services)..... 10
_____ Other (SPECIFY)_____ 11

_____

Student Training

26. Did the project provide occupationally-specific training?

Yes..... (1)
No..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.31)

27. For what occupation was the training provided? Respiratory Therapy Technicians, Hospital Pharmacy Technicians, Flexible Manufacturing Technician

28. For what occupational goal was the training provided? (Circle all that apply)

Obtain a job..... (1)
Improve performance in current job..... (2)
Enhance opportunities for advancement in company (or field)..... (3)
Other (SPECIFY)_____ 4

_____

29. Is the student who completed the training qualified for jobs in a single occupation or in multiple occupations? (Circle one)

Single occupation..... (1) (K)
Multiple occupations..... (2) (M)

30. Is the student who completed the training qualified for jobs in a single industry or in multiple industries? (Circle one)

Single industry..... (1) (K)
Multiple industries..... (2) (M)

31. Did the project provide non-occupationally-specific instruction or training?

Yes..... (1)
No..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.32)

If "Yes", what non-occupationally-specific skills were taught? (Circle all that apply)

Employability skills..... (1)
Basic academic skills..... 2
Advanced academic skills..... (3)
Other (SPECIFY)_____ 4

_____

Student Assessment

32. Did the project assess students' abilities or skill levels?

Yes..... (1)
No..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.33)

If "Yes," what methods were used to assess students? Circle all that apply, and check the appropriate spaces to indicate whether the assessments were conducted at the time of entrance, at intervals during the training, or both.

		At Entrance	At Intervals
Vocational aptitude test	1		
Academic aptitude test	2		
Criterion-referenced achievement test	(3)	✓	✓
Standardized achievement test	(4)	✓	
Review of academic or employment records	(5)	✓	
Assessment of job skills	(6)	✓	✓
Other (SPECIFY)_____	7		

_____

Skills Identification

33. Was the identification of job skill requirements a part of the project?

Yes ..... (1)
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.34)

If "Yes," what methods were used to determine job skill requirements in the field for which training was provided? (Circle all that apply)

Standard or existing skill requirement information utilized ..... (1)
Skill observation at work sites 2
Review of employer job descriptions ..... (3)
Review of previous studies/reports ..... (4)
Conferences with experts or other advisors ..... (5)
Interviews with practitioners in the field ..... (6)
Surveys of employers ..... (7)
Other (SPECIFY)_____ 8

_____

Curriculum Selection

34. Did the project utilize a curriculum?

Yes ..... (1)
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.37)

If "Yes," how was the curriculum selected? (Circle one)

It was developed entirely in-house by project staff ..... (1) (M)
It was adapted/adopted from an existing curriculum already in use within the grantee institution 2
It was adapted/adopted from an existing curriculum used at another institution ..... (3) (K)
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 4

_____

35. In developing the content of the curriculum, were any outside groups consulted?

Yes ..... (1)
No ..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.36)

If "Yes," which of the following groups were consulted? (Circle all that apply)

Prospective employers of participants	(1)
Employers of participants	2
Occupational or industrial associations	3
Unions	4
Faculty of the grantee institution	(5)
Faculty of other educational institutions	(6)
Other (SPECIFY) _____	7

36. Did the project disseminate the curriculum?

Yes	(1)
No	2 (SKIP TO Q.37)

If "Yes," what steps were taken to disseminate the curriculum? (Circle all that apply)

Identified potential users	(1)	
Distributed descriptive literature	(2)	
Reproduced course materials in quantity	(3)	(M)
Established a distribution network	4	
Sold the curriculum	5	
Made presentations	(6)	
Used the media	(7)	
Sent curriculum to professional/trade association	8	
Obtained user feedback	9	
Other (SPECIFY) Submitted to ERIC and sent to each State Voc. Director	10	

Staff Characteristics

37. Please complete Table 2 (on next page) regarding the characteristics of the staff affiliated with the project. The requested information concerns each staff member, instructor, or administrator associated with the project, whether paid from the Cooperative Demonstration Program grant or from other sources. For those staff not paid from the Federal grant, please indicate the source of funding for their wages or salary.

Staff Development

38. Were instructors or staff provided pre-service or in-service training for teaching in the project? (Circle one)

Yes ..... (1)

No, it was not necessary ..... 2 (SKIP TO Q.40)

No, but it would have been valuable ..... 3 (SKIP TO Q.40)

39. Please estimate the number of hours spent by instructors or staff in each kind of training for their work on the project. (Please calculate by multiplying the number of training hours times the number of instructors/staff attending.)

	Hours	
	Instructors	Other Staff
Pre-service training	90 (M) 60 (K)	____
In-service training	50 (M)	____

Table 2. Staff Characteristics

Please complete the following information for each project staff member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Member name (including instructors)	Roy Thomas	Loretta Cole	Brenda Williams	Ralph Green	
Position/title	Project Director	State Health Education Coordinator	Data Systems Coordinator	State T & I Edu Coordinator	
Project responsibilities	Managing Reporting Dissem-ination	Advisory & Dissem-ination	Advisory	Advisory & Dissem-ination	
Wage rate (hourly)	39,267.00 annual	42,000 annual	44,000 annual	41,000 annual	
Date started on project	1/1/90	1/1/90	1/1/90	1/1/90	
Date ended work on project	9/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	
% Full-time equivalent on project	50	5	3	5	
Source of funding (if not grant)	Grant & State	State	State	State	

Total number of hours worked on:

Student assessment					
Training students					
Staff development	25				
Curriculum development	75	10			
Skills identification	25	5		1	
Dissemination/diffusion	100	50	25	60	
Partnerships/networking	25	6	17	10	
Project administration/ planning	1075				
Other (SPECIFY) Preparing Reports	100				
Total hours worked on project	1425	71	42	71	

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Guy Baroni	Murv McDowell	Roman Prezioso	E. R. Smith	
Position/Title	Technical Coordinator	Project Coordinator	Local Site Coordinator	Industrial Liasion	
Project Responsibilities	Technical Coordinator	Overall Project Coordination	Individual/ Project Administration	Industrial Liasion	
Wage Rate	$15/hr	$21.32/hr	$45,320/yr	$40/hr	
Date Started on Project	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	Jan 1, 1990	
Date Ended Work on Project	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	June 28, 1991	
% FTE on Project	100%	100%	10%	10%	
Source of Funding (if not grant)			In-kind	In-kind	

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment	35				
Training Students	550	100			
Staff Development	50	220			
Curriculum Development	1428	422			
Skills Identification	45				
Dissemination/ Diffusion	620	560			
Partnerships/ Networking	45	520		22	
Project Administration/ Planning	100	1100	361	340	
Other	25				
Total Hours Worked on Project	2898	2922	361	362	

TABLE 2B Kanawha County

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Norma Miller	Kim Chaffin	Mark James	Roy Kemp	Miles Crowder
Position/Title	Principal	Instructor	Instructor	Instructor	Instructor
Project Responsibilities	Adm./Planning Staff Dev. Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking	Student Assessment Train Students Partnerships Networking
Wage Rate	$44,090.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual	$22,800.00 Annual
Date Started on Project	1/1/90	7/19/90	7/19/90	10/22/90	7/19/90
Date Ended Work on Project	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	6/30/91	10/19/90
% FTE on Project	10	100	100	100	100
Source of Funding (if not grant)	State	Grant State	Grant State	Grant State	Grant State

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment	20	50	50	35	15
Training Students	0	1320	1320	840	360
Staff Development	32	14	14	10	4
Curriculum Development	18	30	30	21	9
Skills Identification	30	20	20	14	6
Dissemination/ Diffusion	12	6	6	4	2
Partnerships/ Networking	44	100	100	70	30
Project Administration/ Planning	196	140	140	98	42
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours Worked on Project	252	1680	1680	1190	490

STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Please complete the following information for each project team member.
If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Project Staff Name	Karen Cavender	Jean Fisher	Sharon Landsdale		
Position/Title	Consultant	Consultant	Consultant		
Project Responsibilities	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking	Staff Dev. Curr. Dev. Skills Indent. Partnership Networking		
Wage Rate	$100/day	$100/day	$100/day		
Date Started on Project	11/20/90	3/3/90	3/3/90		
Date Ended Work on Project	6/12/91	5/8/91	11/8/90		
% FTE on Project	As Needed	As Needed	As Needed		
Source of Funding (if not grant)	Grant	Grant	Grant		

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development		10	10		
Curriculum Development	30	50	20		
Skills Identification	20	50	10		
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking	10	30			
Project Administration/ Planning	20	20			
Other _					
Total Hours Worked on Project	80	160	40		

Partner Involvement

40. Which of the following groups, if any, have been involved in the planning, administration, or service provision of the project? (Circle all that apply)

None	1
Employers	(2)
Providers of support services, e.g., child care	3
Local JTPA office	4
Other publicly-funded training or job placement agency	5
Unions	6
Employer/trade associations or consortia	7
Local public welfare offices	8
Community-based organizations	9
Schools or universities	(10)
Other (SPECIFY) _____	11

41. How many partner organizations were affiliated with the project?

Number of organizations ..... 6 (K) / 5 (M)

42. Please name the two most important partner organizations. Please list the most important partner first.

	(K)	(M)
1.	Health Care Providers	Fairmont State College
2.	University of Charleston	J & S Machine Co.

For the most important partner organization, please answer the following questions.

43. What kind of organization is it? (Circle one)

Private business	1	
Employer/trade association or consortium	(2)	(K)
Union	3	
Public agency (non-educational)	4	
Educational institution	(5)	(M)
Community-based organization (non-profit)	6	
Other (SPECIFY) _____	7	

44. In which activities was the first partner organization involved with the project? Please circle as many responses as applicable and rank the top three in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

(M)	(K)		
2	_____	Recruited students for training	(1)
	_____	Provided instructional materials	2
1	_____	Reviewed instructional materials	(3)
	3	Provided facilities for training	(4)
	1	Provided equipment for training	(5)
	2	Supplied instructors for training	(6)
	_____	Supplied other staff	7
	_____	Provided cash support	8
	_____	Identified job skills	(9)
	_____	Served on project advisory committee	(10)
	_____	Trained project staff	11
3	_____	Helped project graduates find jobs	(12)
	_____	Other (SPECIFY) _____	13

_____

45. Indicate the predominant type of relationship between the project and the first partner organization. (Circle one)

The partner was a customer of the project, e.g., the project provided customized training to the partner's employees	1	
The partner was a member of an advisory committee or informal board of directors for the project	2	
The partner was a supplier of resources such as equipment and possibly job placements at end of the program	3	
The partner was actively sharing in the delivery of instruction and services	(4)	(K) (M)
The partner was the initiator of the project	5	
Other (SPECIFY) _____	6	

_____

46. Was it a new relationship between the first partner organization and the grantee institution? (Circle one)

Yes, a new relationship	(1)	(K) (SKIP TO Q.48)
No, not a new relationship	(2)	(M)

47. Is the relationship between the first partner organization and the grantee institution stronger than before, as a result of the project? (Circle one)

Yes, a stronger relationship..... (1)
No, not a stronger relationship..... 2

48. Please describe any significant problems that arose between the project and the first partner organization (If no significant problems, skip to Question 50).

_____

_____

_____

49. What steps were taken to solve the problem(s)? Were those efforts successful?

_____

_____

_____

50. Please complete Table 3 (on the next page) regarding the characteristics of the staff from the first partner organization.

For the second most important partner organization, please answer the following questions.
(If there was no second partner organization, skip to Q.59).

51. What kind of organization is it? (Circle one)

Private business..... (1) (M)
Employer/trade association or consortium..... 2
Union..... 3
Public agency (non-educational)..... 4
Educational institution..... (5) (K)
Community-based organization (non-profit)..... 6
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 7

_____

Table 3. First partner organization data

Please complete the following information for each staff member from the first partner organization. If there is not enough space on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

	(Marion)	(Kanawha)			
Partner staff member name (including instructors)	Theodore K. LaRue	14 Staff	See Table 3B		
Position at partner organization	Assistant Prof. Comp. Sci.	Director & Supervision			
Project responsibilities	Consultant In-Service Provider	Advisory & Provide Clinical			
Date started on project	1/1/90	7/18/90			
Date stopped on project	6/28/91	6/30/91			
% FTE on project	3	120			
Total number of hours worked on:					
Student assessment		430			
Training students		1690			
Staff development	50	34			
Curriculum development	10	50			
Skills identification	20	46			
Dissemination/diffusion	10	10			
Partnerships/networking	10	22			
Project administration/ planning		45			
Other (SPECIFY) _____		16			
Total hours worked on project	100	2343			

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	E R Smith J & S Machine	Hawken Associates	W V University	Fairmont State College	Darby
Position at Partner Organization	President		Professor	Professor	Teacher Preston Co School
Project Responsibilities	Liaison	Advisory	Consultant	Consultant	Consultant
Date Started on Project	1-1-90	1-1-90	1-1-90	1-1-90	3-1-90
Date Stopped on Project	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91	6-28-91
% FTE on Project	10	5	3	5	7

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development			40	70	
Curriculum Development			20	20	120
Skills Identification		25	25	20	45
Dissemination/ Diffusion				20	30
Partnerships/ Networking	22	25	15	20	20
Project Administration/ Planning	340	100			
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	362	150	100	150	215

TABLE 3B

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Bryon Young	Bill Pennybacker	Cheryl Snodgrass	Anna Parkman	Karen Zabawezuk
Position at Partner Organization	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept, St. Francis	Dir of Resp. Care Dept. Thomas Mem. Hosp.	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept. Putnam Gen. Hosp.	Dir. of Resp. Therapist Program Univ. of Chas	Dir. of Resp. Care Dept. CAMC
Project Responsibilities	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Members	Advisory Committee Chairperson
Date Started on Project					
Date Stopped on Project	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
% FTE on Project	1.7	.5	.5	1.5	1.8

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment					
Training Students					
Staff Development	8				8
Curriculum Development	10			6	10
Skills Identification	2			1	2
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking	1			20	10
Project Administration/ Planning		10	10		
Other	12				4
Total Hours Worked on Project	33	10	10	27	34

TABLE 3B, Continued

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Ike Fauber	Liz Davis	Tim Bess	JoBeth Nicols	Jay Wildt
Position at Partner Organization	Educational Coordinator	Educational Coordinator	Supervisor	Supervisor	Dir. of Respira Care Dept. at Montgomery Gen.
Project Responsibilities	Works with Students Oversees clinical instructor at General and W&C Div. of CAMC	Works with students Oversees clinical instructors at Memorial Div. of CAMC	Trains students. Oversees clinical instructors at Thomas Memorial Hospital	Trains students Oversees clinical instructors at St. Francis Hospital	Serves on Advisory Committee. Works with students. Oversees clinical instructors
Date Started on Project	7/18/90	7/18/90	7/18/90	7/18/90	3/90
Date Stopped on Project	6/14/91	6/14/91	6/14/91	6/14/91	Continuing
% FTE on Project	13	13	30	30	17

Total Number of Hours Worked on:

Student Assessment	85	85	85	85	50
Training Students	170	170	500	500	250
Staff Development					8
Curriculum Development					10
Skills Identification					2
Dissemination/ Diffusion					
Partnerships/ Networking					1
Project Administration/ Planning					
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	255	255	585	585	321

TABLE 3B, Continued

PARTNERSHIP ORGANIZATION DATA

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the partner organization. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets.

Project Staff Name	Barbara Gastinean	Tom Robinette	Jeff Hess	Heidi Braun	Mike Danner
Position at Partner Organization	Dir. Of Out-Patient Pharmacy	Dir. Of Pharmacy Thomas Mem. Hosp.	Dir. Of In-Patient CAMC General	Dir. Of Pharmacy Women's & Childrens Hos	Dir. Of Pharmacy Montgomery Gen. Hosp.
Project Responsibilities	Advisory Committee Member Supv. Students while at this site.Help with Program Dev.	Advisory Committee Member Supv.Students while at this site.Help with Program Dev.	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site	Supervise students while they visit this clinical site
Date Started on Project	7/18	7/18	7/18	7/18	7/18
Date Stopped on Project	6/30	6/30	6/30	6/30	6/30
% FTE on Project	3	3	2	2	2
Total Number of Hours Worked on:					
Student Assessment	8	8	8	8	8
Training Students	20	20	20	20	20
Staff Development	5	5			
Curriculum Development	10	10			
Skills Identification	8	8	8	8	8
Dissemination/ Diffusion	2	2	2	2	2
Partnerships/ Networking	2	2	2	2	2
Project Administration/ Planning	5	5	5	5	5
Other					
Total Hours Worked on Project	60	60	45	45	45

52. In which activities was the second partner organization involved with the project? Please circle as many responses as applicable and rank the top three in the space provided on the left. ("1" is the most important, "2" is the second most important, etc.)

(M)	(K)		
		Recruited students for training	(1)
		Provided instructional materials	2
	1	Reviewed instructional materials	(3)
		Provided facilities for training	4
		Provided equipment for training	5
		Supplied instructors for training	6
		Supplied other staff	7
		Provided cash support	8
1	2	Identified job skills	(9)
2	3	Served on project advisory committee	(10)
		Trained project staff	11
3		Helped project graduates find jobs	(12)
		Other (SPECIFY) _____	13

_____

53. Indicate the predominant type of relationship between the project and the second partner organization. (Circle one)

The partner was a customer of the project, e.g., the project provided customized training to the partner 1

The partner was a member(s) of an advisory committee or informal board of directors for the project ..... (2) (K)

The partner was a supplier of resources such as equipment and possibly job placements at end of the program ..... (3) (M)

The partner was actively sharing in the delivery of instruction and services 4

The partner was the initiator of the project 5

Other (SPECIFY)_____ 6

_____

54. Was it a new relationship between the second partner organization and the grantee institution? (Circle one)

Yes, a new relationship ..... 1 (SKIP TO Q.56)

No, not a new relationship ..... (2)

55. Is the relationship between the second partner organization and the grantee institution stronger than before, as a result of the project? (Circle one)

Yes, a stronger relationship ..... (1)

No, not a stronger relationship 2

56. Please describe any significant problems that arose between the project and this second partner organization (If no significant problems, skip on to Question 58).

_____

_____

_____

57. What steps were taken to solve the problem(s)? Were those efforts successful?

_____

_____

_____

58. Please complete Table 4 (on next page) regarding the characteristics of the staff from the second partner organization.

Contingencies

59. Were there any activities planned in the original grant application that the project was unable to accomplish? (Circle one)

Yes	1
No	(2) (SKIP TO Q.62)

60. What activities were not implemented successfully? (Circle all that apply)

Student recruitment	1
Student assessment	2
Student training	3
Staff recruitment	4
Staff development	5
Skills identification	6
Job placement	7
Curriculum development	8
Dissemination	9
Partner recruitment/involvement	10
Scheduling or contracting services	11
Other (SPECIFY) _____	12

_____

Table 4. Second partner organization data

Please complete the following information for each staff or volunteer from the second partner organization. If there is not enough space on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

	(Marion)	(Kanawha)			
Project staff name (including instructors)	E. R. Smith	Anna Parkman			
Position at partner organization	President J & S Machine	Director of Resp. Ther. U of Charleston			
Project responsibilities	Liaison	Advisory			
Date started on project	1/1/90	1/1/90			
Date stopped on project	6/28/91	6/30/91			
% FTE on project	10	1.5			
Total number of hours worked on:					
Student assessment					
Training students					
Staff development					
Curriculum development		6			
Skills identification		1			
Dissemination/diffusion					
Partnerships/networking	22	20			
Project administration/ planning	340				
Other (SPECIFY) _____					
Total hours worked on project	362	27			

61. Please indicate the reason(s) that planned activities were not accomplished. (Circle all that apply)

Expected funds failed to materialize	1
Partner organization(s) participated at less than expected level	2
Proposed/expected partner organization(s) did not participate at all	3
There were problems with staff recruitment and/or staff retention	4
There were problems with student recruitment and/or student retention	5
The 18-month grant period was insufficient time to complete all the planned activities	6
There was a decline in employer demand for trainees	7
Other (SPECIFY) _____	8

_____

62. Were any activities accomplished by the project that were not planned at the time the original application was written? (Circle one)

Yes	(1)	(M)
No	(2) (SKIP TO Q.64)	(K)

If "Yes," please indicate which of the following unplanned activities were accomplished. (Circle all that apply)

Student recruitment	1
Student assessment	2
Student training	3
Staff recruitment	4
Staff development	5
Skills identification	6
Job placement	7
Curriculum development	(8)
Dissemination	9
Partner recruitment/involvement	10
Scheduling or contracting services	11
Other (SPECIFY)_____	12

_____

63. Please describe the circumstances that enabled the unplanned activities to be accomplished.

Curriculum was developed which could be used with secondary as well as adult students.

Darby Schafer of Preston County Schools provided unexpected input.

Project Outcomes

64. Please complete Table 5 (on the next page) regarding the outcomes from the project. The requested information concerns the numbers of students and/or staff entering, receiving, and completing training or other services under the project. Each of the project's courses or activities should be considered separately.

65. What "rewards" were students likely to receive as a result of training? (Circle all that apply)

A degree/diploma	1
A vocational certificate	(2)
A license (or relicense) for a trade	(3)
Entrance into an occupational training program	4
A job in a particular field	(5)
A promotion in a particular field	(6)
A promotion with particular employer	(7)
Acceptance into further education	(8)
Mastering a set of skills in a non-degree or certificate program	(9)
Access to job networks or job opportunity information	10
Other (SPECIFY) _____	11

Project Costs and Sources of Funding

66. Please complete Table 6 (on page 28) regarding the costs incurred by the project and the funding sources used to pay for those costs. The data should include all costs incurred by the project, not just those paid from the Federal grant or the local match. For example, the project may have used funds from a State grant or other local sources for training that closely parallels that of the grant and which contributes to the grantee's larger program in the field.

TABLE 5A, Project Outcome Data

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	ADA Course				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	9				
Participating	9				
Completing	8				
Not completing	1				
# of hours training or service	108				
# of service sessions	18				
# placed in jobs	4				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

TABLE 5A, Continued

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Introductory DOS	ADA Teacher Workshop	Introductory DOS	CMU - FMI State Col Manager Workshop	CAD - Intro FMI State Col Manager Workshop
Number of grantee students					
Registering	11		4		
Participating	11		4		
Completing	11		3		
Not completing	0		1		
# of hours training or service	24		24		
# of service sessions	12		12		
# placed in jobs	11		3		
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering		30		4	3
Participating		30		4	3
Completing		30			
Not completing		0			
# of hours training or service		18		4	4
# of service sessions		2.5		1	1
# placed in jobs		N/A		N/A	N/A
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering			3	22	12
Participating			3	20	11
Completing			3	-	11
Not completing					
# of hours training or service			12	4	4
# of service sessions			3	1	1
# placed in jobs			N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE 5B

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Respiratory Technician				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	34				
Participating	34				
Completing	24				
Not completing	10				
# of hours training or service	1418				
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs	21				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

TABLE 5B, Continued

Please complete the following information for each course or activity (e.g., in-service, training, day care, etc.) offered by the project. If there are not enough spaces on this sheet, please photocopy additional sheets and attach.

Course title or activity	Pharmacy Technician				
Number of grantee students					
Registering	29				
Participating					
Completing	23				
Not completing	6				
# of hours training or service	654				
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs	12				
Number of grantee staff/instructors					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					
Number of non-grantee participants					
Registering					
Participating					
Completing					
Not completing					
# of hours training or service					
# of service sessions					
# placed in jobs					

TABLE 6, Project Costs and Sources of Funding

TOTAL

	Federal grant funds	Non-Federal cash contributions	Non-Federal in-kind contributions	Other resources*
Personnel costs:				
Teachers/instructors	$ 172,525.00	$	$	$
Administrators	18,231.65	14,127.00	16,234.00	
Other certified personnel			12,800.00	
Clerical/support	20,792.67		1,300.00	
Other (SPECIFY)				
Fringe benefits	28,199.84	4,586.96	5,069.00	
Other direct costs:				
Non-computer equipment			30,000.00	150,000.00
Computer hardware			45,000.00	
Computer software	27,432.93			
Space rental			3,600.00	
Telephone	234.71	50.00	460.00	
Instructional materials	13,705.27			
Textbooks	18,738.96			
Travel/transportation	12,800.64	1,139.00		
Subcontracts	(335,708.74)	Subcontracts - Duplicate		
Materials and supplies	7,973.10	500.00		
Other (SPECIFY):				
Printing & Binding	11,837.62	500.00		
Consultants	25,541.25			
Third Party Evaluator	4,300.00			
Advertising	1,400.00			
Indirect costs	13,793.00			
Total costs	377,506.74	20,902.96	114,463.00	150,000.00
Total project resources	$ 662,872.70			

*Resources which were not identified in the grant application or final grant budget but which were expended on behalf of the project.

TABLE 6A

	Federal grant funds	Non-Federal cash contributions	Non-Federal in-kind contributions	Other resources*
Personnel costs:	$	$	$	$
Teachers/instructors				
Administrators	18,231.65	14,127.00	5,025.00	
Other certified personnel				
Clerical/support	5,562.03			
Other (SPECIFY)				
Fringe benefits	6,631.36	4,586.96	1,049.00	
Other direct costs:				
Non-computer equipment				
Computer hardware				
Computer software				
Space rental				
Telephone	11.73	50.00		
Instructional materials				
Textbooks				
Travel/transportation	5,195.25	1,139.00		
Subcontracts Third - Party Evaluator	4,300.00			
Materials and supplies	362.31	500.00		
Other (SPECIFY):				
Printing & Binding	2,389.00	500.00		
Indirect costs	3,414.67		1,873.00	
Total costs	46,098.00	20,902.96	7,947.00	
Total project resources	$ 74,947.96			

*Resources which were not identified in the grant application or final grant budget but which were expended on behalf of the project.

TABLE 6B

PROJECT COSTS AND SOURCES OF FUNDING

	Federal Grant Funds	Local Cash Match	Local Inkind Match	Other Project Resources
Personnel costs:				
teachers	104,600			
administrators			6,800	
other certif. personnel			12,800	
clerical/support	15,230.64			
other salaries/wages				
Fringe Benefits	15,944.04		2,696	
Other Direct Costs:				
non-computer equipment			30,000	
computer hardware			45,000	
computer software	27,432.93			
space rental			3,600	
telephone	222.98		460	
instructional materials (see computer software also)	1,007.30			
textbooks	748.70			
travel/transportation	6,705.39			
subcontracts (see consultants)	-			
materials and supplies	896.14			
other: consultants	20,541.50			
other: printing/publishing	5,600			
Indirect Costs	5,400			
* **Total Costs**	204,329.62		101,356.00	

Total Project Resources $ 305,685.62

* As of 7/26/91 - Note: Books not closed as of this date.

TABLE 6C

PROJECT COSTS AND SOURCES OF FUNDING

	Federal Grant Funds	Local Cash Match	Local Inkind Match	Other Project Resources
Personnel costs:				
teachers	67,925.00			
administrators			4,409.00	
other certif. personnel				
clerical/support			1,300.00	
other salaries/wages				
Fringe Benefits	5,624.44		1,324.00	
Other Direct Costs:				
non-computer equipment				150,000.00
computer hardware				
computer software				
space rental				
telephone				
instructional materials	12,698.07			
textbooks Medical Reference	17,990.26			
travel/transportation	900.00			
subcontracts Consultants	4,999.75			
materials and supplies	6,714.65			
other: Advertising	1,400.00			
other: Printing/ Binding	3,848.62			
Indirect Costs	4,978.33			
Total Costs	127,079.12		7,033.00	150,000.00
Total Project Resources	$ 284,112.12			